UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
39001015934790

UNIVERSITY
OF
ARIZONA
LIBRARY

This Volume
Presented to the Library
by
T. E. Hanley

L250

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/economiclawsofar0000sirh

N
8680
S6

THE

ECONOMIC LAWS OF ART PRODUCTION

An Essay towards the Construction of a Missing Chapter of Economics

by

SIR HUBERT LLEWELLYN SMITH
G.C.B.
(Chairman of the British Institute of Industrial Art)

LONDON
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
HUMPHREY MILFORD
1924

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
LIBRARY

PRINTED IN ENGLAND
AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
BY FREDERICK HALL

MADE AND PRINTED

PREFACE

THE following pages contain the substance of a course of public lectures which I delivered in the spring of the present year at the London School of Economics. The idea of that course was originally suggested by the discovery that there was no existing text-book, and indeed no generally accepted body of economic doctrine, which covered even approximately the subject-matter of the syllabus entitled *Art in relation to Commerce* which had recently been included by the University of London in their scheme of studies for the Bachelor of Commerce degree. As that syllabus had been drafted at the request of the University by the British Institute of Industrial Art I felt some responsibility for the situation. Hence this first essay towards filling the gap.

The contents of the lectures have been re-arranged and revised, and a good many additions have been made. The result, however, has no pretension whatever to be regarded as a complete or systematic treatise. On the contrary, I wish to emphasize the provisional and preliminary character of the work which has so far been achieved. It is, in fact, mainly spade-work, and my only justification for publishing the book in its present form is my earnest hope

164608

that it may serve to stimulate further thought and constructive criticism and research, on a subject which seems to me of vast importance for the future well-being of the country, but which has hitherto been almost unexplored.

Art has, of course, been the subject of countless books, historical, philosophical, imaginative, critical or other, while Art critics have not infrequently made trenchant comments on current economic theories as understood by them. The object of the present book is, however, somewhat different, viz. to apply the methods of economic science to the discovery and exploration of the special laws and tendencies which affect the production and distribution of material objects, *in so far as they fall within the category of works of art.* It is no part of the plan to present a history or philosophy of Art. In fact I have carefully refrained from any discussion of the ultimate cause and nature of Art and Beauty, and have confined attention strictly to the material objects through which they find expression. I have tried to limit and simplify the discussion by excluding such immaterial modes of Art-expression as music and poetry, which are only mentioned very occasionally by way of illustration or analogy.

Throughout the book the term 'economic' is used in a very wide sense, to cover many phenomena which are perhaps more usually called 'sociological'. If this be a fault I readily acknowledge it, but I would plead in extenuation that the distinction between the two fields of research is extraordinarily difficult to draw, and that any narrowing of the definition would have made the present inquiry less fruitful in positive results.

In various parts of this book I have urged the necessity for further research into certain basic problems of Art and Industry. I am glad to be able to say that with the aid of funds provided by the University of London and the British Institute of Industrial Art a beginning has already been made with this research, and I hope that before long the first results will be ready for publication.

I have to express my cordial thanks to Professor W. R. Lethaby, Sir Sydney Chapman, and Mr. Percy Ashley for their great kindness in reading the proofs and giving me the benefit of many valuable suggestions. To Professor Lethaby my deep gratitude is also due for the help which he has given me throughout, both by his generous encouragement and by his penetrating criticisms.

H. LLEWELLYN SMITH.

June, 1924.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. THE ECONOMIC MEANING OF A WORK OF ART.

Scope and object of the inquiry—Not concerned with the ultimate nature of Art or Beauty—Economic characteristics of a Work of Art—A product of Labour possessing certain qualities—Utility—Congruity or Fitness—Unity—Beauty—A working definition—The conception of Art-Values—Measurement of Art-Value—Its limitations—Local and general elements in Beauty—Fine Art and its relation to Common Art. Pages 13–40

CHAPTER II. UNITY AND SUBDIVISION IN RELATION TO WORKS OF ART.

Adam Smith's doctrine of Division of Labour—How far and with what reserves applicable to Works of Art—Necessity of preserving Unity—Derivative Works of Art—Simple and Composite works—The meaning of Design—Relations between design and production—Historical causes of their separation—Effects of the Industrial Revolution—Specialization of the Arts—Change of basis of classification from product to process—The breakaway of special Arts from their parent Craft groups—Its results on Art development. Pages 41–71

CHAPTER III. THE POSITION AND FUNCTION OF DESIGN IN MODERN INDUSTRY.

Influence of Machine Industry in restricting range of designer's control—Standardization—Weakening of relations between designer and producer—Rise of 'design' as a separate business—Consequent necessity for technical adaptation—The 'styler'—The design studio—Tendency of studio-design to migrate to distant centres—Or even to foreign countries where conditions are favourable—Economic dangers of this divorce from manufacture—Suggested remedy through development of the independent studio—Criticism of this scheme—Alternative suggestion to develop the functions of the Workshop designer—Its difficulties and advantages.

Pages 72–109

CHAPTER IV. ECONOMIC FITNESS AS A CONDITION OF ART-VALUE.

Technical and Economic Fitness—Ought economic fitness to have weight in determining Art-Value?—Individual and social standards of fitness—Principal of 'Least Cost'—Relations between Art standards and current standards of living—Modern mal-adjustment between Art and Industry—Weakening of 'reactions' between different economic factors—Each factor however retains a certain power to influence the Art-standard—Conditions which determine and limit this power. Pages 110–134

CHAPTER V. INTERNATIONAL INTERCOURSE IN WORKS OF ART.

The economic theory of International Values—Instability of Art-Values when inter-cultural frontiers are crossed—tendency to depreciate when Works of Art pass into culturally distant fields—Effect of this law on different classes of Works of Art—International Frontiers tend to become inter-cultural frontiers—It does not follow that international intercourse diminishes Art-Values—Or that isolation conserves them—For contact between Art Cultures may result in new developments and blends—This is a quasi-biological phenomenon.

Pages 135–150

Chapter VI. The Evolution and Modification of Artistic Styles.

Meaning of 'Style'—Causes of development—External pressure (Demand factor)—Internal modification (Supply factor)—Pressure of new wants and tastes—Natural selection—Continuous small variations—Discontinuous changes ('mutations')—Examples—The Supply factor—Unconscious accommodation to environment—Discoveries of methods or materials—Conscious 'eclecticism'—Effects of intermingling of Styles—Short-period deviations from the Style-curve (meaning of 'Fashions')—Long-period trends (meaning of 'Classic')—The problem of 'period-work'. Pages 151–168

Chapter VII. The Interaction of National Art Cultures.

Alternative results of impact of Alien Cultures—Destructive, fertile, or barren—The criteria—Relative strength—Degree of affinity—Stage of development—Historical examples—Cretan pottery in Cyclades, Greece and Egypt—Blends between Saracenic and Gothic Art—Barren contact between Mohammedan and Hindu Art—Eclecticism of Akbar—Mogul Art and Western influence—Hindu and Persian painting—Gandhara sculpture—Limits of spread of Gothic in Europe—The factor of Age—The rigidity of Egypt—Channels of Art-intercourse—The travelling Artist—Diffusion of wares—Diffusion of knowledge—Interaction of styles in country of import—Or of export—Results of Machine industry—Destructive contact between West and East—Need for further study. Pages 169–200

Chapter VIII. Periodic Movements of Art Energy.

Great Art epochs require groundwork of traditional Common Art—They follow no known law of periodicity

—Analogy of Economic Cycles—Cumulative effect of Psychological factor—Infectious nature of enthusiasm and of pessimism—Causes which arrest upward movement—Point of exhaustion not reached simultaneously in all Crafts—Analogies in credit cycle—Examples of sudden break and gradual decline—Effect of outside catastrophes—And of internal decay—Programme of further research—Tendency of Art Movements to be world-wide. Can an outburst of Art energy be hastened by conscious effort?—No short cut to 'Fine Art'. Pages 201–214

Chapter IX. Epilogue.

Is there an 'effective demand' for Art?—And is Art desirable?—Limitations of present inquiry—Elements that elude analysis—The basic condition for living Art Culture—Not dependent on any particular form of social organization—But on its healthy functioning—Influence of forms of social organization on types of Art Culture—Interruption of Art-traditions by Industrial Revolution—Succeeding period of artistic anarchy—This transitional period not yet ended—Effects of Revolution on different countries and branches of Art—Necessity of conscious effort to re-establish organic connexion between Art and National Life—This re-establishment is essential basis of further Art progress. Pages 215–235

CHAPTER I

THE ECONOMIC MEANING OF A WORK OF ART

It is the purpose of this book to explore the possibility of elucidating some of the problems of Art, and especially of Art in relation to industry, by applying the methods of economic science.

Political economy, as conceived by the great classical economists, is concerned with discovering the laws affecting the production, distribution, exchange, and consumption of commodities, or, as it is sometimes stated, of material goods and immaterial services. While no very rigorous or uniformly accepted definition has been arrived at of the scope of the terms 'commodities', 'goods', or 'services', it is clear that even the narrowest definition must be wide enough to include the whole range of works of art, whether a picture, a cathedral, a statue, a piece of jewellery, a woven fabric, or even a poem or a symphony. Ordinary economic laws, so far as they are correctly formulated, are therefore as fully applicable to works of art as to any other category of goods or services. As, however, any laws which apply to all classes of commodities without distinction must necessarily be very general in character, the useful information which they yield with regard to the special characteristics and economy of any particular class of goods is often somewhat meagre and unsatisfactory. Consequently economists have been led more and more in recent years to study intensively with the aid of special investigation, and historical research, the laws, conditions, and tendencies of particular industries and particular forms of economic activity and structure.

It is in line with this modern tendency that I propose to give special study to the economic laws affecting the production and distribution of works of art. There is a strong practical justification for selecting this group or category of commodities for intensive investigation, since there is every probability that the more advanced industrial countries like our own will find that the struggle for future economic leadership will turn more and more on quality rather than on quantity of production. Hence all the economic problems which are special to works of art are destined to become of greater and greater practical importance.

I have spoken of works of art as forming a special class or category of economic products, and at the present stage it is convenient, for the sake of simplicity, to regard them provisionally in this light, although it will presently appear that the more accurate way of describing them is not as one particular limited class of products, but rather as a very wide range of products looked at from a particular angle and estimated by a particular standard.

Postponing for the moment this more difficult conception, and regarding works of art provisionally as forming a special category of commodities, it is essential that we should form some general idea of the marks or characteristics by which this category is distinguished. It is fortunately not necessary for our purpose to attempt any definition of the fundamental ideas of Art or of Beauty. Just as economists are rightly content to accept the technical results of other sciences as data or starting-points for their reasoning, without intruding on the domain of those sciences by independent investigation of their fundamental data, so we are not called upon to pursue inquiries into the ultimate nature and cause of the phenomena of Beauty and Art, which are the proper subject-matter of aesthetic philosophy rather than of economic science.

In the present inquiry we are mainly concerned with practical results rather than with ultimate causes, and it is far more important to analyse the technical and economic conditions and limitations which govern the manifold forms and modes in which Art expresses itself in the material world, than to hunt for a formula to define the precise nature of the central 'idea' of which they are the manifestations. Nor are we concerned to ascertain the psychological mode in which this 'idea' is apprehended by the human reason or emotions, or its precise relation to such other fundamental objects and aspects of human desire and aspiration as moral or scientific truth.

Whether the exploration of this field of inquiry by aesthetic philosophy has yielded or is likely to yield results of practical value is a question on which opinions may differ. It is certain that any attempt to pursue the inquiry by the methods of economic analysis would be foredoomed to failure, and it may be observed that great artists and poets who stand personally in the closest relations with the ultimate source of artistic inspiration are least of all men inclined to dogmatize on the question of its nature. It is the general verdict of great artists and poets that art and beauty reveal themselves through action, but that their meaning cannot be formulated in words.

Christopher Marlowe has given deathless expression to this truth :

> If all the pens that ever poets held
> Had fed the feeling of their masters' thoughts,
> And every sweetness that inspired their hearts
> Their minds and Muses on admirèd themes ;
> If all the heavenly quintessence they still
> From their immortal flowers of poesy,
> Wherein, as in a mirror, we perceive
> The highest reaches of a human wit ;
> If these had made one poem's period
> And all combined in beauty's worthiness,
> Yet should there hover in their restless heads
> One thought, one grace, one wonder, at the least
> Which into words no virtue can digest.[1]

Abstaining, therefore, from the impossible attempt to define that which is indefinable by any means at our command, we confine ourselves to the humbler task of trying to arrive at a working definition not of essential Beauty or of Art in itself, but of works of art considered as economic products, i.e. to discover the criteria by which we may distinguish such works from other objects of beauty on the one hand and from commodities in general on the other.

(1) In the first place a work of art must be a product of human labour. In this respect works of art are much more limited in range

---

[1] *Tamburlaine the Great*, Part 1, Act v, Sc. i.

than objects of beauty. A landscape, a flower, a human form, may be beautiful, but we do not term it a work of art, but confine this term strictly to objects which are the result of human labour. This first characteristic of a work of art—that it is a product of human labour—is of course shared with all the commodities which are the subject of ordinary economic analysis.

(2) The second characteristic of a work of art is that it must fulfil some useful function. Stated thus broadly and generally this characteristic is also shared to a greater or less degree with all other commodities, but in the case of works of art it is present in a peculiarly intense degree. As economic students are aware, the term 'utility' in modern economic theory (e.g. as expounded by Stanley Jevons and his successors) is devoid of any ethical or even qualitative content. It merely means that an article is an object of human desire, and it is conceived as measurable by a purely quantitative standard corresponding to the amount of satisfaction or gratification of desire which results from its possession or consumption. To Jevons the whole of economic theory was a 'Calculus of pleasure and pain'. This crude notion of utility, however, is far from adequate for the purpose of the economic analysis of works of art. It is essential to the idea of a work of art not only

that it should supply a human demand, or even that it should aim at supplying it in the best possible way, but also that the desire which it aims at fulfilling should be worthy of being fulfilled. We shall, in fact, find as we proceed that one of the most important criteria which determines the *rank* of a work of art is the degree of nobility of the function which it aims at performing.

Hence the doctrine of utility applied to works of art involves two important differences from the pure Jevonian doctrine applicable to commodities in general, (1) in emphasizing the element of quality of fulfilment of function, (2) in implying a doctrine of 'ends' as well as 'means'.

We are here at the parting of the ways between the economics of quantity and of quality. We have, moreover, reached a danger point in the discussion, since the notion of the graduation of human desires according to quality brings us into the region of ethical considerations, and very near to the hotly contested question of the relations between Art and Morals. Evading so far as possible this 'devastated area' of aesthetic controversy, we content ourselves with laying down that 'utility' as applied to works of art has a qualitative as well as a quantitative significance. Borrowing the language of mathematics, we may say that 'utility' as an element in a work of art is a function of two variables, (1) the degree of perfection of the adaptation of means to ends, (2) the degree of nobility of the ends sought. Obviously we are here dealing with 'imponderables', and for our purposes the rough and ready methods of estimating utility and value in the Jevonian sense are of comparatively little service.

It will not escape observation that the law laid down above that a work of art must possess utility is in apparent contradiction to a doctrine, first formulated by Aristotle and repeated again and again by a long line of successors, according to which the test of 'fine art' as distinct from 'common' or 'minor' or 'industrial art' is its freedom from any utilitarian purpose. This theory has been trenchantly criticized by writers such as Professor Lethaby,[1] and it is repugnant to the view of Art taken by the Morris and Ruskin school. It is not the business of the economist to take sides in current art controversies if it can be avoided, but it may be suggested that the Aristotelian use of the term 'utilitarian' was very much narrower than the sense in which we employ it, and might almost be taken as implying something base. Moreover, if the term utility be admitted to have a qualitative as well as a quantitative import the Aristotelian distinction does not differ greatly from a distinction between the high and low quality of the desire to which the work of art ministers.

---

[1] *Form in Civilization.* See especially the Essay 'What shall we call beautiful?'.

We may at least claim the support of Quintilian: 'There is never true beauty apart from utility.'[1]

(3) The third characteristic of a work of art is that it must obey what we may term the law of 'congruity', that is to say, it must loyally conform to the limiting conditions imposed by the materials and other technical conditions of its production. This is a law which the economist need not prove; he has only to accept it as the considered verdict of artists and experts. It is the general experience that attempts to violate this 'law of congruity' result in the production of bad works of art. There is no more fertile source of debased and bastard art than the effort to imitate in one material or by one set of tools or processes an effect which is only suitable to another material or to another kind of tool or process. By this I do not mean

---

[1] 'Nunquam vera species ab utilitate dividitur' (*Or. Inst.* viii. 3). I am indebted for the quotation to Sir Thomas Jackson's *Byzantine and Romanesque Architecture.*

that one form of art may not legitimately borrow from another motifs which were evolved from different technical processes. For example, Greek pottery may have taken hints from Babylonian woven tissues, and there are many examples of this 'give and take' between the arts in good periods of art activity. It is when the borrowing passes beyond the limit of suggestive reminder and becomes an attempt at deceptive imitation that it becomes a mark of debased and degraded art.

(4) The fourth characteristic of a work of art is that it must be a single entity exhibiting a unity of plan or design. From this fundamental law flow the most important practical consequences, which will be worked out in detail in succeeding chapters.

The statement that unity is a quality essential to the individual life and coherence of a work of art must not be understood to imply that every work of art must consciously conform to a pre-arranged design. Unity is a principle of vital growth, to be conceived biologically rather than mechanically. It will appear as we proceed that unconscious processes play a very important part in traditional art.

(5) Lastly, it is essential to a work of art to possess the quality which we call 'beauty'.

We have agreed to renounce any attempt to arrive at a fundamental definition of the nature of beauty and of its ultimate source or cause. But the difficulty disappears if we approach the matter from the point of view of practical effects rather than of ultimate causes. Looked at from this angle the 'beauty' of a material object is simply the quality whereby it is attractive to our sight, and thus arouses our love and admiration. In economic language it is the factor in demand which arises from the appeal to the eye. With beauty in immaterial things which appeal to us through some organ of sense other than the eye we are not here directly concerned, but we may surmise that a similar proposition holds good *mutatis mutandis* in the case of music and poetry.

The direct causal relation between beauty and love is of course universally familiar in the case of sexual attraction, but the relation between the beauty of an inanimate object and our desire to possess it is not dissimilar in kind. In neither case is physical beauty the exclusive cause of attraction. Moral, spiritual, or intellectual qualities may also arouse love between the sexes, and our desire for a work of art is influenced by such considerations as its utility, fitness, or cost. So closely interwoven are these various causes of attraction that it is difficult to isolate any one of them, and to frame any useful propositions about 'beauty in itself' divorced from the other essential factors in a work of art. So much have some felt this difficulty that they have even suggested a doubt whether beauty is an independent element at all, or whether it may not be simply the resultant of all the other factors, including perfect fitness for useful function. It is unnecessary to accept a view so contrary to common experience and belief. But while we must regard beauty as an original and independent source of attraction in a work of art, it must be admitted as a result of experience that its attractive force can only be fully exerted if the other essential elements of art-value are also present.

Hence, finally, we may say that a product of human labour is called beautiful, if while fulfilling the conditions of fitness for useful function it also attracts our love and admiration by its appeal to the eye.

It may be remarked in passing that some far-reaching conclusions flow from this proposition. For example, it follows that beauty is not intrinsic in an object, but consists essentially in a relation between that object and an observer, and that its measure must therefore depend on the qualities of the observer as well as on those of the object itself. This will be found of some importance in connexion with the theory of art-values.

We have now arrived at a coherent working definition of a work of art considered as an economic commodity. It must be a product of human labour, exhibiting unity of conception, fulfilling a useful function by means well suited both to its purpose and to the means of its production, and possessing the quality of beauty.

This will serve as an adequate working description of a work of art to enable us to distinguish it from other kinds of economic commodities, though it cannot claim to be a fundamental definition since it leaves open two basic questions, viz. the nature of 'utility' and the nature of 'beauty'.

The first thing that strikes us about the above formula is that, with the exception of the two qualities first named (viz. that a work of art must be a product of labour possessing unity), all the elements of the description are relative rather than absolute. Such terms as 'useful', 'well-fitted', and 'beautiful' are all comparative terms, and it is impossible to say *a priori* how much utility, fitness, and beauty are essential to the composition of a work in order to qualify it to be described as a 'work of art'.

Thus we are naturally led to view the whole matter from a somewhat different angle, and to regard every product of human labour which possesses unity as a potential work of art, its place in the ascending scale of art-values being determined by its utility, fitness, and beauty. If we could imagine an ideal standard by which these qualities might be quantitatively measured the resultant figure would fix the position of each product possessing unity of design in an ascending scale of what (for want of a better term) I have called 'art-values'.

Looked at in this way the problem of defining a work of art is not so much a problem of defining a special class of products which differ fundamentally from all other products, as a problem of valuation of products according to the extent to which they possess certain specific properties, viz. utility, fitness, and beauty. This way of regarding the question is in harmony with the great 'Law of Continuity' which Dr. Marshall has made the foundation of his *Principles of Economics*. 'Natura non facit saltum', and it is contrary to reason and experience to expect to find commodities divided into two water-tight classes, consisting respectively of products which are or are not 'works of art'. The distinction is not absolute but comparative; a matter of less or more.

I have personally little doubt that there are other economic categories which are commonly thought of as constituting separate groups or species of goods and services, but which are more accurately defined in terms of valuation. Take for example the elusive and difficult conception of 'Capital', which is usually regarded as a special category of products (viz. those intended for the particular purpose of assisting future production), but which may also be looked on as the aggregate of products valued according to a special principle, viz. productivity. And there are other economic problems which are better approached from the point of view of valuation than of classification. However, this is a digression, and to discuss the proposition further would lead us too far from our present subject.

It is now necessary to examine more closely this question of art-values, which we have referred to above in terms implying (though not definitely proving) that such values are measurable quantities. No one of course would suppose that art-value (or for that matter value in the ordinary economic sense of the word) is measurable by any physical standards analogous to those by which we estimate weight, length, temperature, or electric current. As all value depends essentially on human wills, wants, and desires, it is clear that the only possible unit of measurement is a human judgement and not a physical constant. Where (as in the case of a staple article of commerce such as cotton or wheat) the exchange value is fixed as the resultant of a very large and continuous stream of judgements working on comparatively simple and homogeneous data, the resulting series of price quotations may display some of the characteristics of physical ascertainments like the readings of the thermometer or barometer. Where (as in the classical illustration of the exchange value of an antique work of art) the value is fixed by the competing judgements of a small number of experts working on complicated data which admit of great differences of interpretation, the inconstant human basis of price determination becomes more clearly evident to all.

Of course, in speaking of the measurement of 'art-values' I am in no way referring to the fixing of the exchange values of works of art, which is a totally different matter. It is only in certain exceptional circumstances, rather accidental than normal, that the exchange value of a work of art is proportionate to its art-value in the sense in which we are using this term, viz. the measure of the extent to which an article possesses certain specific qualities (such as utility, fitness, and beauty).

Now suppose that a number of art workers were to enter into a competition for the production of a specified type of article, e.g. a picture of a given subject, a building of a given character, a war memorial, or a challenge cup. A competent judge should be able, without insuperable difficulty, to range the competing works roughly in order of artistic merit. If the works were submitted to a number of competent experts acting separately, the order of merit assigned by each would perhaps differ but slightly, so long as the judges were drawn from the same 'cultural area', and the conditions were sufficiently clear and detailed to ensure that the authors were aiming substantially at the same objective. In such circumstances a meeting of the judges for discussion, explanation, and adjustment of points of view should usually enable a unanimous verdict to be returned, and this verdict might not only range the competing works in order of merit, but actually assess roughly the relative value of each work by a system of marks, just as in the case of an ordinary examination paper. The marks so assigned would then represent the 'art-value' of each of the competing works of art relatively to the others according to the judgement of competent experts. I use this purely hypothetical example of an ideal board of examiners merely as a vivid illustration of what I mean by the concept of ‘art-value’. I do not, of course, wish to press the illustration beyond what the subject-matter will bear, or to follow the example of Fergusson (the eminent historian of Architecture), who went so far as to construct index numbers by which he made a numerical comparison of the merits of the Parthenon and the Taj Mahal.[1]

But while this method of determining art-values, viz. by the consensus of opinion of impartial and competent experts, falls far short of the precision of physical measurements, yet (within certain limits to be mentioned) it may yield as true and objective results as many of the methods of measuring economic quantities which are more familiar to the economist, and which are all ultimately based on human opinion.

The limitations, however, are very serious. In the case of the ideal ‘examination’ which we have imagined it is essential (1) that the works assessed shall be of kindred character, and (2) that they shall be judged by experts of kindred cultural affinities. It is hardly conceivable that any expert board, however competent, could assess by marks the relative merits of a number of heterogeneous works of art (e.g. a jewel, a picture, a carpet, and a church). And it would generally be difficult to obtain a real consensus of judgement as to the relative merits even of kindred works of art from the members of an international or 'intercultural' board of examiners, drawn from cultural areas having little affinity either among themselves or with the creators of the works of art submitted to their judgement.

---

[1] See Fergusson, *True Principles of Beauty in Art*, p. 140. Art-value was analysed into Technic, Aesthetic, and Phonetic values. The final Index Number for the Parthenon was 24 and for the Taj Mahal 20.

It follows that we can only attach a precise quantitative meaning to 'art-values' within certain comparatively narrow limits, and that we are not justified in generalizing the conception, by (for example) treating the aggregate of the 'art-value' of the national production as though it were a real and theoretically ascertainable quantity which we should aim at 'maximizing'. Nevertheless, within the limits assigned the conception of art-value as a definitely measurable quantity independent of exchange value is of great importance.

There is one essential characteristic of a work of art which has not entered into the above discussion of art-value, not because it is of minor importance, but because it is a quality which is absolute and not relative, and consequently does not lend itself to measurement. This characteristic is unity of plan or purpose. It is evident that to create a work of art it is not sufficient to heap together an aggregate of beautiful objects or parts. It is essential to the idea of a work of art that these parts should be organically related among themselves, or in other words that they should all be subject whether consciously or unconsciously to a central plan or design. To a work of art unity is what life is to an organism or sovereignty to a State. Destroy it and dissolution results.

We shall see later that while unity is absolutely essential to a work of art, this unity may manifest itself in different modes, somewhat analogous to the different manifestations of ‘ sovereignty ’ in various types of ‘ centralized’ and ‘federal’ political States. But as ‘ sovereignty ’ is the necessary condition of political independence, so unity is a necessary mark of an independent work of art.

Although we have deliberately refrained from the exploration of the ultimate nature of beauty lest we should overstep the limits between economic science and aesthetic philosophy, there is nevertheless one limited aspect of the question which we cannot altogether pass by, because it has an important economic bearing. It is necessary for us to look a little beneath the surface for the purpose of ascertaining how far the quality which we call beauty is really economically homogeneous, or how far the elements which enter into it may be governed by different economic laws. For example, are all these elements equally affected by changes of time and place? It is clearly impossible to limit the term ‘beauty’ to the impression made on an observer through his eye by pure form or colour emptied of all significance. If we were to attempt such an unnatural limitation we should be driven at once to invent a new terminology to describe what we now term the expressive or significant aspects of beauty.

Enjoyment (say) of a picture is a compound of at least two different elements—gratification of the sense of colour and form, and interest in and appreciation of the artist's idea and meaning. The former we may perhaps term the decorative, the latter the expressive factor of beauty. But the latter factor is itself complex, comprising as it does within a single term all kinds and modes of significant expression, from the definite historical information, or even moral precept, conveyed by a picture story or stained glass window, to the power which particular forms and colours, purely decorative in their appeal to the majority of observers, may have of calling up associations to those who have the key to their significance. Thus the appeal of a Persian rug or a medieval cathedral is made up of many elements some of which are, relatively speaking, general, world-wide, and permanent, others particular, local, and transitory. Or (more accurately) the beauty of a work of art can be resolved into a number of factors differing in relative strength according to the individual observer, and in particular depending to a varying degree on conditions of place and time. Whether or not it is possible to assert that any elements of beauty are absolutely independent of time and place is a question of aesthetic philosophy on which the economist is not called upon to express an opinion. But it is necessary for our purpose to recognize that the expression 'beauty' covers not only qualities like harmony of colour and proportion, the 'values' of which are relatively 'inelastic' in the economic sense (i.e. the appreciation of which varies but slightly over a wide area of space and time) but also qualities which are essentially dependent on particular personal, geographical, cultural, and historical conditions, and the appreciation of which may therefore vary very widely and rapidly when those conditions are changed.

We shall better understand the economic importance of this analysis when we come to consider the international interchange of works of art, and the mutual reactions of different art cultures and styles.

The recognition of the expressive or significant element of beauty has its counterpart in the recognition of ‘fitness’ as an essential element in ‘utility’ as applied to works of art. By ‘fitness’ (precisely the Greek *τὸ πρέπον*) we mean perfect adaptation both to function and to means of expression. Perfect fitness is to a work of art exactly what perfect health is to a living organism.

What has been said above may furnish a clue to the difficult and perplexing question of the distinction between fine art or great art and common art.

It is a vulgar error, though consecrated by antiquity, to regard certain methods of art expression (such as the painting of pictures or the sculpture of statues) as constituting ‘fine art’. Aristotle based the distinction on the supposed absence of utilitarian purpose in painting and sculpture. But if we include significant expression under our broad conception of utility it is evident that this distinction breaks down, and there is no reason for regarding the application of oil paint to canvas with a brush as differing in kind from any other mode in which art finds material expression, or as any more free from the limitations imposed by the nature of its means of execution, or the function which it has to fulfil.

Nevertheless there is a real meaning in the term 'fine art' which it is very important to grasp. We must in fact recognize that all the elements of which art-value is composed are not on the same plane. Some, like unity of design, are basic conditions common to all works of art. Others, like depth of meaning and nobility of conception and expression, are qualities which admit of infinite gradation, and it is the presence of these qualities in a high degree which justifies the use of the term 'fine art', irrespective of the technical conditions of production. Thus the distinction between 'fine art' (or as it is sometimes termed 'great art') and 'common' or 'lesser' or 'minor art' is not a distinction of technical process or purpose, but rather one of quality and energy.

History shows that the production of a continuous flow of works of 'great' or 'fine' art has mainly been confined to a few comparatively brief periods, which at first sight seem to have occurred almost at random on certain parts of the earth's surface, but which on investigation prove without exception to have been but the culmination of long periods of preparation and gestation during which art production has been essentially of a 'common', 'vernacular', or traditional nature. When by a favourable combination of conditions the outburst takes place there is a comparatively short period of dazzling art life and energy, followed by rapid collapse and decay, after which the more permanent forms of 'common' or low-power art regain their ascendancy.

It is natural to speak of these movements in terms of life, growth, fruition, decay, and death. But the analogy of biological processes, though useful and obvious must not be pressed too far. Instead of regarding epochs of 'fine art' as the normal and periodic outcome of centuries of preparation, the recurrence of which can be predicted like the return of summer, we must in the present state of our knowledge look on them as the rare result of exceptional combinations of favourable conditions which cannot, generally speaking, be expected to recur within a measurable time on the same spot of the earth's surface. Nor can we by any process of economic analysis account fully for these explosive outbursts of art energy. I shall in a later chapter[1] endeavour to describe some of the characteristic features of these waves of artistic energy, and it may be hoped that hereafter, by patient comparative study, we may be able to carry this description much further. But we can no more explain the art of Pheidias or Michael Angelo by merely describing their historic setting than we can explain Isaiah or Shakespeare.

---

[1] See chapter viii.

We are here in the presence of a phenomenon which transcends our power of analysis. We may convey some faint idea of the relation of 'great' or 'fine' art to common or vernacular art, by borrowing analogies and imagery from other fields of human knowledge and activity. In terms of mathematical physics we may speak of great art as common art raised to a high 'power' or 'potential'. With the chemist we may think of their relation in terms of the heat and energy generated by the combination of bodies themselves comparatively inert. Or finally with the philosophic or religious mystic we may speak of epochs of special inspiration and creative energy or the outpouring of the Spirit. But all the time we must feel that we are in the presence of an ultimate mystery which with our finite capacities we cannot wholly comprehend, and which we are powerless to explain by the methods of scientific research.

What we are mainly concerned with for our economic purposes is not the rare and glorious outpouring of 'fine art' in the true sense of the term, but the permanent substratum of 'common' art—the soil which is essential to the growth and flowering of great art, though it may only yield this blossom at rare intervals and for short periods. It is this common art, which is, or might be, always with us, which neither dazzles our eyes nor transcends our imagination, the conditions of whose healthy life can be discovered by our reason and observation, and maintained or impaired by our policy—which is the proper subject-matter of this book. For it is by steadily maintaining common art in the soundest health and fullest vigour and not by spasmodic efforts to recall to life the dead style of some past period of great art that we can best prepare the ground for a possible future efflorescence.

But it must not be thought that the sole or principal function of common art is to prepare the way for a distant and problematical outburst of great art. Such a view is certain to lead to a distortion of perspective, and to a false estimate of relative values. We have to maintain and foster a high level of common art to meet the everyday needs of the present. It is our duty to trim and feed its lamp during the long night of waiting, for the sake of the light which it gives here and now, and not merely in order to be prepared to meet and greet the bridegroom if and when he may appear. It is impossible to over-estimate the value to a country of continuously maintaining its common art at the highest point of healthy development, quite independently of any possibility that some day it may blossom into fine art. The fostering of common art means caring for utility, fitness, and beauty in all branches of national life.

CHAPTER II

UNITY AND SUBDIVISION IN RELATION TO WORKS OF ART

ADAM SMITH'S great 'Inquiry into the nature and causes of the Wealth of Nations' opens with an analysis of the economic advantages which result from division of labour, and the limitations to which those advantages are subject. Though Adam Smith wrote in the very early stages of the Industrial Revolution whereby manufacturing industry has been transformed, he rightly regarded the principle of human co-operation, together with the consequent specialization of functions and subdivision of industrial processes, as of cardinal importance in any investigation of the factors in economic progress. In his treatment of the subject of division of labour Adam Smith has been followed by a series of expositors, such as Gibbon Wakefield, Babbage, John Stuart Mill, and others, each of whom has added some new feature to the picture, without however affecting its main lines. Adam Smith's famous account of the advantages of division of labour in pin-making has become classical, and though to-day there are hundreds of branches of manufacture in which the degree of subdivision is much greater than that which Adam Smith described, his illustration still holds the field.

Adam Smith shows that 'a workman not educated to this business . . . could scarce, perhaps, with his utmost industry make one pin a day, and certainly could not make twenty'. But 'not only the whole work is a peculiar trade but it is divided into a number of branches of which the greater part are likewise peculiar trades'.[1] Pin-making is described as being divided into about eighteen distinct operations, and so great was the consequent increase in productive power that in a small manufactory employing only ten men and where some of the operations were consequently performed by the same man, the daily output of pins per head was 4,800.

This increased productivity, which appeared so enormous in those days, Adam Smith attributes mainly to three causes—the increase of dexterity due to specialization, the saving of time in passing from one employment to another, and the greater opportunity offered for the utilization of machinery. To these advantages Babbage added a fourth—viz. the possibility of classifying and arranging labour so as to assign the most appropriate worker to each process, thus saving the great waste which results from the use of highly skilled labour on unskilled work.

---

[1] *Wealth of Nations* (ed. Rogers), vol. i, p. 6.

Adam Smith recognized only two limitations to the advantages of division of labour —one technical and one economic; viz. the technical limits of the possibility of subdividing any particular process, and the economic limit of the capacity of the available market to absorb the resulting products.

Throughout the whole discussion Adam Smith and his followers invariably assume that the product resulting from subdivided production is indistinguishable from or at least equal in quality to that resulting from undivided craftsmanship. Indeed, the only reference to quality in the whole of Adam Smith's exposition is his passing suggestion that nails made by a common smith without special training or subdivision will be not only few in number but 'very bad ones'. He evidently takes it for granted that the increased dexterity of each individual operator by which the successive parts of the process are performed must necessarily result in a better, or at least in an equal, article as the final product. And this would usually be true if the article were merely a mechanical aggregation of parts, and derived its value and significance solely from the intrinsic merits of those parts, and not at all from their mutual relations and reactions as members of a single organism.

But the fact that a work of art is an organic structure and not a mechanical assemblage of parts introduces a wholly new factor into the problem.

Consider, for example, how the whole of Adam Smith's argument would have required recasting if in place of an ordinary pin his illustration had been a jewelled brooch. Probably the making of a jewelled brooch could be subdivided even further than that of a pin, but it is obvious to all that the final result of assembling the parts would be to produce a brooch differing essentially from the brooch produced by undivided labour. How far the result would be worse or better depends on a number of considerations besides the relative dexterity of the specialized and of the unspecialized craftsman.

It follows from the above analysis that in the domain of works of art and art-values we cannot adopt without serious criticism and reserve the results arrived at by the classical economists as regards the effects of division of labour on efficiency, which were based on the study of repetition work on a large scale.

Our first reserve is based on the essential characteristic of a work of art, that it must possess the quality of unity. This condition necessarily limits the extent to which the principle of division of labour can be advantageously applied to works of art and governs the mode of such application. For unless that division is so carried out as not to impair the unity of the work, the resulting art-value must necessarily be decreased.

The second reserve is that as works of art do not consist of mere mechanical aggregations of parts, but are organic structures or combinations of elements, the result of subdivision of labour will usually be a final product differing essentially from the original work of art produced by undivided labour. We shall in fact have created a fresh art-form with a character and quality of its own : an art form having of course many and intimate relations with the original 'model' from which it is derived, but not a full duplication of that model. We may call the resulting art-form a derivative work of art.

We may sum up what has been said, by saying that in the case of works of art division of labour, if it is not to lead to destructive results, must respect the essential unity of the product. Subject to this governing condition subdivision of process will generally result not in the multiplication of 'replicas' identical with the original work of art, but in the creation of derivative works of art bearing the impress not only of the original work from which they were derived, but also of the different technical conditions under which they are produced and to which they must conform.

Thus a lithograph is not rightly to be considered as an inferior imitation of a painting, but as a distinct art-form of a different if subordinate class, fulfilling different technical conditions and deriving part of its art-value from conforming to these conditions. The same is true throughout the whole range of industrial art.

We shall find as we proceed that one of the most fundamental problems of industrial art is to find the best means of reconciling the antagonism between the artistic condition that any work of art must have a unity of its own, and the economic condition that division of labour is essential to reduce the cost of production.

The former of these conditions, viz. that unity is an essential condition of a work of art, is a principle so fundamental that it is perhaps best for our purposes to regard it as axiomatic rather than to attempt to derive it from any other principle. It may, however, be illustrated by examples.

A poem or a drama even if subdivided into cantos or scenes remains a unity, but a book of poems, though it is a collection of works of art, is not necessarily a work of art in itself. Whether it is so or not depends on the question whether there is a single dominating principle in the selection and arrangement of the poems which gives to the whole collection the essential character of unity.

So again an exhibition of pictures e.g. at the Royal Academy or the Salon could not be described as a work of art in itself, though it includes many such works. On the other hand the frescoes which adorn the Spanish Chapel at Santa Maria Novella at Florence or the Sistine Chapel at the Vatican are not only works of art taken individually, but by their combination make up a single though composite work.

This principle of unity in a work of art is another expression for what is frequently described as its 'design' or 'composition', and as already stated it may be realized by unconscious processes as well as by conscious planning.

Though this unity is absolutely essential to a work of art, it does not necessarily imply that there is only one designer. Many works of art (e.g. great buildings) have had a succession of designers, while in the case of composite works of art (i.e. works which are composed of a number of elements each of which is a distinct work of art) there may be a multitude of separate designers at work simultaneously. In a cathedral —perhaps the most striking example of the composite work of art—there may be wood-carvers, stone-carvers, glass painters, fresco painters, iron workers, mosaic workers, and others, all working more or less independently of the central designer or architect as regards the creation of their own special art-forms, provided always that the unity of the whole is respected by the subordination of each form of art and decoration to the general plan.

Thus while the unity of a simple work of art may be compared to the 'sovereignty' of a centralized state, that of a composite work of art is analogous to the 'sovereignty' of a Federal State, each separate work of art which enters into the combination having a certain degree of independence or sovereignty of its own, but limited by and subordinate to the central purpose of the composite work as a whole.

The general inference which emerges from the above discussion is that the subdivision of processes in the making of a work of art will tend to impair or even destroy the art-value of the resulting product unless two conditions are satisfied: (1) that the unity of the work of art be effectively maintained by the common connexion of each member of the group of producers with a central authority or designer by whom the general scheme of production is planned and supervised; (2) that in planning and executing the work of art by subdivided processes, full respect be paid to the fresh conditions and limitations imposed by the system of subdivision.

The second of these conditions has already been noted, and need not detain us further at the moment. We are, however, especially in modern industry, deeply concerned with the former of the two conditions, viz. that the value of a work of art is essentially dependent on the maintenance of an effective link connecting each individual or group carrying on any part of the process of production with a single central 'authority' or source by whom the whole scheme of production is planned and supervised.

This central 'authority' is what we mean by the 'designer' in the widest sense of that term. If the links between the designer and the various processes of production are severed, the resulting product perishes as a work of art—as surely as an organism perishes when once the central link among its functional organs is destroyed.

Let us now consider further the problem of subdivision in the creation of works of art, with special reference to the particular case of the differentiation between design and execution, and trace the economic and artistic consequences which flow from that differentiation.

Of all possible lines of subdivision of functions in the production of works of human labour, this distinction between design and execution is the most obvious. The distinction between making a plan and carrying it out, between the conception of an idea and its practical embodiment in material, between the function of the 'Creator' and of the 'Demiurge', is a distinction running through all departments of human thought and activity.

If in art production under modern conditions we could assume an omniscient and all-foreseeing designer and a body of unerring and perfect executants, we might perhaps regard their respective functions as not only distinguishable but even independent, and the work of art resulting from their combined efforts would differ no more from the product of a single artist-craftsman, than Adam Smith's famous pin made on the principle of subdivision of labour differed from the pin laboriously made by the single workman. But in the actual state of human limitations and fallibility, these ideal conditions are very far indeed from being realized, so that the two functions of design and execution, though distinguishable in thought, are always closely connected and interdependent in practice. The right adjustment of the mutual relations between these two functions presents the most fundamental economic problem of modern industrial art, and the question therefore requires detailed examination.

(*a*) In the first place the technical and economic conditions of production, the nature of the tools and materials, the purposes which the product is to serve, and the market limitations on cost impose conditions and restrictions on the freedom of the designer and narrow the channels through which he can express his ideas. Hence it is essential that the designer should fully understand the nature of these limiting conditions. This understanding he may endeavour to acquire more or less perfectly in three ways, by himself practising the craft, or by learning the technique in a workshop or school or otherwise, or finally by maintaining close association with the craftsmen by whom the design is executed.

The first of these methods is of course the most completely satisfactory, but it is only fully applicable in practice to cases in which the process of execution is either undivided or is only split up into comparatively few subdivisions. Moreover, it is frequently open to criticism on economic grounds as requiring the artist to spend an excessive portion of his time on manual processes. There is, of course, another side to this question. Time spent in the less creative and interesting part of work may be far from wasted, but may serve a healthy purpose by way of 'dilution'. We cannot at the present stage go in detail into these matters. All that can be said is that the designer must obtain an adequate understanding of the technical conditions of the craft for which he is designing, and that this implies an intimate knowledge of tools, methods, and materials.

(*b*) It is, however, not only as a restraining and limiting factor that a thorough acquaintance with the technique of production is of importance to the designer. Practical knowledge of processes and tools has also frequently a positive value in suggesting new forms and combinations to the designer. To take a very simple example, beautiful forms of ornament have been directly suggested by brush-work forms, i. e. the shape of the mark naturally made by the free impression of a brush of elastic hair. Examples might be multiplied.

(*c*) It is often impracticable for the designer to foresee exactly how his design will work out in practice in all its details, and if the best artistic results are to be achieved the preliminary sketch prepared in advance of the actual execution must be regarded not as a complete and final scheme or specification to be adhered to in all its details, but rather as what in lawyers' language would be described as the 'heads' of a scheme, to be gradually elaborated, and if necessary corrected, as the practical work of execution proceeds. To continue the legal analogy, the designer's first sketch plan (to which the term 'design' is currently though wrongly confined) resembles the draft of a Parliamentary Bill, as it leaves the draftsman's hands, which supplies the groundwork of discussion and criticism, but which may be largely amended or even transformed before it finally reaches the statute book. No doubt the extent of these modifications will depend largely on the capacity and foresight of the original draftsman. The more he has been able to visualize and provide for the various contingencies that might arise, and the various points of view that might find expression in Committee, the less chance there is that his first plan will need radical amendment. So, as has already been suggested, an omniscient and all-foreseeing designer might produce in advance plans for a work of art so perfect in all their details that they would need no subsequent readjustment. But in existing circumstances the treatment of the designer's sketch as a definitive design or plan, which is incapable of development or modification, and which is mandatory in all respects on the executive staff, must almost always involve an artistic loss; a loss which may be more or less serious according to the circumstances of each case (e.g. the degree of competence of the designer, and the character of the technical process), but which is not seldom of crucial importance.

In the case of a craft like the painting of pictures in which the process of subdivision has rarely gone beyond the stage of delegating to pupils the less difficult and important parts of the picture, the division between design and execution is less sharply drawn, and the constant interaction between the two processes is more obvious and generally recognized than in the case of most artistic crafts and industries. A painter's first sketch is rarely identical in composition with the finished picture, and his design is subject to continual modification as the picture grows under his hand. Here the adjustment is automatically effected, the designer and executant being the same individual, or possibly a group of individuals working throughout under a single master.

In architecture the reactions between design and execution are even more manifest, since the architect's plans are necessarily small-scale drawings, and the actual effect of carrying them out can with difficulty be fully predicted, without full-scale trials. Here again the wider the range of experience, the keener the power of observation, and the more vivid the imagination of the architect, the less likely will it be that his office-plans will need drastic alteration. Nevertheless, the effects of perspective, light and shade, &c., are so difficult to predict from a small-scale drawing or model, and the possibility of new and valuable ideas being suggested by the progress of the actual work is so important, that the best architectural results are difficult to attain when (as is frequently the case in modern buildings) the functions of design and execution are completely severed, so that the builder is bound by a 'cast-iron' contract to give effect to the precise details of the architect's plans, and the architect's power of supervision of the work is virtually limited to ensuring that his previously accepted plans are properly carried out.

The above examples are intentionally taken from crafts which have not undergone transformation into 'great industries', with the consequent necessity of 'standardizing' their products and of multiplying copies by the methods of so-called ‘mass production’. It is more convenient before proceeding to analyse the more complex phenomena which meet us in the great machine industries, to form clear ideas as to the relation of design and execution in the simpler case of the making of a single work of art not intended for reproduction by mechanical processes.

While the fundamental underlying principles are independent of the mode or scale of production, their practical working out is profoundly affected by the differences between the economic conditions which govern the simple undivided craft and the highly organized large-scale industry—differences which are reflected in the art forms proper to these different sets of conditions. Thus the old traditional common art was largely unconscious and instinctive, and customary practice played a large part in determining the character of art work, without the intervention of any special designer. This quality of spontaneity, to which so much of the charm of folk-art is due, tends to decay with the development of industrial organization, for organized co-operation necessarily involves clear delimitation of function and the careful pre-arrangement of a common plan. The loss of spontaneity and growth of self-consciousness which result from organization have to be frankly accepted, and set off against the vast increase of power, range, and economy which large-scale production brings with it. It is worse than useless to attempt to mask the change by base imitation. The hammer-marks which express the process by which the silver or copper bowl was beaten into shape add to its interest and attractiveness, but imitation of these marks on a 'spun' bowl only arouses disgust. Hence we must expect the art forms proper to 'mass production' to be more reasoned and explicit and less instinctive and unconscious than those proper to the old traditional crafts.

We may summarize the results of our preliminary analysis as follows. In the process of creating a work of art by human labour the functions of design and execution are distinguishable in thought but not independent. In primitive folk-art the distinction is only implicit, and is largely unconscious, and as with the growth of specialization it becomes conscious and explicit, the result is a loss of spontaneity and a growth of self-consciousness in the art-forms which differentiate them from those of the old customary common art. When the two functions are allocated to separate persons, the performance of the one function still reacts on and is influenced by the performance of the other. This reaction may be not merely negative and limiting, but also positive and stimulating. The degree to which the two persons or groups are in practice interdependent is determined partly by the nature of the art and craft, i.e. the medium of expression, the methods and instruments by which and the purposes for which the work of art is created; partly by the degree of perfection with which each person or group performs his separate function. But for human beings of finite capacity and liability to error the general law holds good that where in the production of a work of art the functions of design and of execution are assigned to different persons, the persons performing the two functions must maintain a close association—or some adequate substitute for such close association (not at present discernible) must be discovered.

We have now to consider what in fact have been the historical tendencies with regard to the association or separation of the two functions of design and execution, what are the economic or other forces by which these tendencies have been set up, and finally what are the directions in which in modern times and under present-day economic conditions the processes of subdivision or of re-integration are progressing, and how they are likely to develop in the near future. When this objective study of facts and tendencies has been completed we shall be in a position to criticize the results, and to form a judgement on the practical question how far the modern tendencies disclosed by the inquiry are healthy or destructive from the point of view of art-creation, and how far any prejudicial elements in these tendencies are capable of being eliminated or corrected by conscious efforts.

It is a very common belief that the separation between the designer and the manual executant of the design is a modern phenomenon, due to the introduction of the great machine industry, whereby the process of production has been transformed from a handicraft into a series of minutely subdivided machine processes. The influence of machinery and subdivision of manual work on the relations between design and manufacture is, as we shall find, of the very greatest importance, but the thesis that this is the primary cause of separation between the two functions is historically untenable. In some branches of art creation (such, for example, as architecture) there must always have been a line of separation between the making of the plan and the carrying of it into effect, though doubtless not so sharp a line as in modern times. In sculpture—at all events decorative and architectural sculpture, the designer has not attempted, even in the greatest periods of art, to execute the whole or the greater part of the work which he designed. Thus, by universal consent sculpture reached its highest point of excellence in Greece in the fifth century B.C., and the greatest master in that greatest period of the art was Pheidias. The work by which Pheidias will always be chiefly remembered (not necessarily his greatest work, for his independent statues have perished) is the sculptural adornment of the Parthenon, for which he was wholly responsible. Yet there is authority for the view that none of the Parthenon marbles which have come down to us were carved by the chisel of Pheidias, except for a few final touches and corrections, though nothing is more certain than that Pheidias presided over the whole work and was personally responsible for the greater part of the design.[1]

Or to take an example from a beautiful oriental handicraft—the Japanese lacquer work of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—it is believed that the great painters such as Korin, who furnished many of the designs and attached their names to the works of art, seldom carried out the actual technical operations of lacquering.[1] Though in painting the tendency to separate design from execution has, as already observed, been less marked than in most other artistic crafts, some of the masters at the best period of the Italian Renaissance went so far in delegating execution to their pupils that in some of their larger works they practically confined themselves to design and supervision. Of this practice Perugino's workshop offers a striking example.

---

[1] Ernest Gardner, *Handbook to Greek Sculpture*, Ch. III, especially pp. 300 and 320.

In all these cases the effective cause of the specialization of the designer was the rarity of his talent, and the consequent necessity of conserving it for the most important functions and of not permitting his energy to be wasted on any processes which could be performed sufficiently well by others whose time was of less value. It was of more importance that Pheidias should supervise the whole of the decoration of the Parthenon than that he should himself carve some of the figures on the pediment or frieze.

No doubt in many cases this primary artistic motive, based on the principle of conserving artistic energy, and using it to the best advantage, was strongly reinforced by the more purely economic motive of private gain. Certainly, if tradition is to be trusted, Perugino was not a bad example of the 'economic man'. On the other hand, if we could imagine Athens in the fifth century B.C. ruled by an all-wise socialist government impervious to all money considerations, it is highly probable that the functions that it would have assigned to Pheidias would have been precisely those which he performed under Pericles.

---

[1] Blacker, *The A B C of Japanese Art*, p. 69.

It is, however, idle to attempt to analyse men's motives and to assign their exact weight to those of a higher and of a lower order respectively. It is enough for our purpose that wherever the faculty of creative design is scarce, compared with the effective demand for that faculty, there is always a powerful tendency, partly economic, partly artistic, towards restricting those who possess this rare faculty to the kind of creative work which they alone can perform. Up to this point the tendency towards differentiation of function is quite independent of any transformation of the technical or commercial organization of the craft or industry itself, e.g. of any revolution in productive methods by the introduction of machinery and the subdivision of labour, or in commercial methods to meet the necessity of making standardized products on a large scale to suit a variety of market conditions.

But had it not been for the influence of the group of technical and commercial changes which are generally known as the ‘industrial revolution’ the tendency to subdivision in art production would probably have stopped short at the specialization of the designer, leaving in his hands not only the framing of the preliminary plan but also the continuous supervision of its execution. The advent, however, of the great machine industry caused profound and widespread changes in the relations between art and industry, both by limiting the range of the designer's influence over manufacturing processes, and by continually weakening the links and widening the gulf between designer and producer. Thus has gradually grown up the central and most difficult problem of modern industrial art—a problem which is of such crucial importance that it demands special and detailed treatment.

Leaving then this vitally important matter to be pursued in the following chapter, I pass to certain other aspects of the problem of unity and subdivision. For it must be clearly understood that the differentiation of function between designer and producer, though perhaps the most striking single illustration of the law of specialization as applied to art production, is only one out of many examples of the operation of that law.

Another very important mode in which the same principle is manifested is the growth of specialization in the arts themselves. This process does not consist merely of a simple multiplication of the separate branches of art-work through the continual splitting up of what was formerly considered a single art. It consists rather of a combination of two simultaneous tendencies, one of differentiation and the other of reintegration, whereby the old units into which the arts were formerly grouped have been split up, and the resulting fragments regrouped along new lines. There has been a gradual weakening and dissolution of the old bond of association, and the substitution of a new and different principle of unity. In this matter the history of art production does not stand alone: the course of industrial development in general exhibits a similar tendency, which indeed is a characteristic feature of all social and organic evolution. It is in fact another way of stating Spencer's famous definition of evolution as progress 'from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity'.

Broadly speaking, if we look at industrial progress as a whole we can detect a common principle underlying many of the various and complex phenomena of differentiation and re-integration. This principle is the tendency to substitute similarity of process for similarity of product as the primary criterion of the grouping of the crafts. For example, the engineer, instead of being specialized according to the type of machine which he produces, becomes specialized according to the particular process which he performs (fitting, turning, &c.), and he performs this specialized process on a wide variety of machines. So the typical wood-worker is not the maker of doors, or ships, or furniture, but the carpenter, joiner, or cabinet-maker—these crafts (including the third in spite of its retention of a traditional product-name) being differentiated mainly by the tools employed.

A corresponding process of evolution in art production gave rise to such crafts as those of the goldsmith, the sculptor and the painter, distinguished from other crafts either by the nature of the materials in which they worked, or the tools which they employed, or the nature of the process which they performed, rather than by that of the product which they created.

This first phase of specialization in the production of works of art involved two important consequences, the one dangerous, and the other beneficial to art development.

The subdivision of the work of producing an article along the line of process, materials, or tools, evidently threatens the vital unity of the work produced, and as this unity is an essential quality of a work of art, the maintenance of its art-value comes to depend absolutely on maintaining unimpaired the relations between each process-craftsman and a central designer of the whole work.

On the other hand, the integration of a craft on the basis of process has in the past had a tendency to increase the security of the artist or craftsman's position, and to extend widely the geographical range within which he could find scope for his skill. For being no longer tied to the production of a particular article, the demand for which might be evanescent or local, he could wander far into other regions or even into foreign countries certain of finding some opportunity of exercising his craft. When we come to discuss the conditions of the international intercourse in works of art and the interpenetration of art cultures we shall find that the migrations of the travelling artist and craftsman carrying with them their knowledge and traditions of workmanship and technical methods have been in the past a very powerful factor in the diffusion of artistic styles and in promoting a fruitful blend between national art cultures.

Unfortunately this first phase of specialization has by no means been the last. Under the powerful influence of economic forces there has been a continual tendency towards further subdivision, either a more minute specialization of process, or (perhaps even more commonly) a secondary or subsidiary subdivision along the primitive lines of product. Thus the goldsmith, instead of making all kinds of gold wares, specializes on particular forms of jewellery ; the sculptor confines himself either to decorative carvings or to figure work ; and the painter may specialize along either line, or along both lines concurrently (e.g. as between oil, water-colour, fresco, &c., as materials, or as between the production of historic scenes, portraits, landscapes, or decorative panels). In the case of painting and sculpture this secondary specialization does not go very deep, and many artists of course practise several of the different branches. But in industries which have been transformed by the Industrial Revolution the lines of division are much sharper, deeper, and narrower, and often make it extremely difficult to maintain any real unity in the final result.

Where, as in the case of painting and sculpture, the medium through which the artist works is so readily responsive to his ideas as to make it possible for him to express himself freely, fully, and deeply, and with comparatively little obstruction by mere technical difficulties, there is a constant centrifugal tendency, i.e. a tendency on the part of the art or of some specialized branch thereof to break away from the craft-group with which it was originally connected, and to pursue a separate course of development as an independent art. Thus in the fifth century B.C. the art of picture painting in Greece broke away from the ceramic art in connexion with which it had hitherto developed, but the technical restrictions of which had now become embarrassing to its further growth. So in Italy, in late medieval times, the decorative craft of wall painting and the goldsmith's art of adorning altar-pieces with painted decoration broke away from the parent crafts and united in the independent art of painting separate movable pictures. Arts which thus won their untrammelled freedom by cutting their connexion with the parent group often developed rapidly and brilliantly on independent lines. But usually they attained their most perfect development while the memory and tradition of the common art-group from which they sprang and from which they now were severed still remained living and potent. As this tradition became weakened, and the parentage and relationships of the specialized art, together with the implied conditions of its healthy life and function, became forgotten or ignored, a process of rapid decay set in, sometimes with startling suddenness. This is what occurred in Italian painting after the magnificent development which culminated in Michael Angelo, and though it would be rash without further research to claim historical support for the thesis that this law is of general application, there are *a priori* grounds for expecting this to be the case.

This is an aspect of the working of the dual principles of unity and subdivision in relation to works of art which will be found of special interest and importance, when we come to analyse the causes and trace the course of wave movements of artistic energy, and especially when we endeavour to define the relations between great and common art. Doubtless in each separate historic case the decay which set in could be connected with various special and local causes and conditions, social, political, or economic. But we may nevertheless suspect that beneath all these phenomena there have been common underlying forces at work.

As in political society so in art creation the fight for liberty, for freedom of self-expression, for discarding the trammels of conditions that have been outgrown, is a fight which attracts the noblest spirits and brings out some of their finest qualities. It is therefore natural that during the progress of this fight, and throughout the period immediately following, while the tradition of former conditions still survives the greatest triumphs of art should be won.

Afterwards comes a time when liberty itself becomes a snare, for human nature is so constituted that most men can only do their best work under the discipline of conditions which, while they limit the range of their discretion, also provide wholesome rules and guidance for its exercise. The picture so often drawn for our warning of the autocrat, unlimited in his powers and right, gradually degenerating into an arbitrary tyrant, is also a warning as to what may happen in the case of any art which has freed itself from the limitations of function and method imposed by its historical affinities and traditions, or by the technical conditions of its production. Hence arts which detach themselves completely from their parent group often tend, after a comparatively short though glorious period of independent life, to lose their bearings, to falter and become erratic in their purpose, and, after drifting into aimless extravagance, to fall into ruinous decay.

This is perhaps one of the reasons why arts in their early struggles towards an independent life and before that independence has been fully won, make such a strong appeal to our admiration and affection in spite of their imperfect mastery of material and technique, while the technically superior results of more maturely developed arts are apt to leave us cold. In the long run no art can afford to forget or ignore its family relationships or the conditions of its childhood.

CHAPTER III

THE POSITION AND FUNCTION OF DESIGN IN MODERN INDUSTRY

For the purposes of this chapter the term 'Modern Industry' must be understood to mean not the aggregate of industries of all types and scales which co-exist in modern times, but industry of the characteristic modern type, i. e. large-scale production carried on by machinery. It is obvious that at any given moment and in any given country crafts and industries exist side by side belonging to very different stages of economic development. The problems of industrial art which confront these different types of industries and crafts are profoundly different, for, as has been hinted in the previous chapter, the modes of art expression proper to the wholly different economic conditions which govern the simple primitive craft and the complex modern industry differ very widely, so widely in fact as almost to obscure their underlying unity. In the present chapter we are not concerned with the unconscious and instinctive art of common tradition, but solely with the problems of design arising in connexion with large-scale production.

When once the process of subdivision of labour in the production of a work of art has reached the stage of separating design from manual execution and assigning the two operations to two separate sets of persons, a whole series of important problems, artistic, technical, and economic, is opened up with regard to the precise functions and mutual relations and reactions of these sets of persons and their respective contributions to the production of the final work of art.

In the forefront of these problems is the question—vital from the artistic point of view—of the extent of control which the designer is able to exercise over the product in the making, that is to say during successive stages of production.

Since the processes of design and execution are not mutually independent but react upon each other, it is evident that their severance must *prima facie* result in artistic loss, unless counterbalanced by some adjustment of relations between designer and executant, which will preserve the possibility of those healthy reactions between them which are important factors in the art-value of the resulting product. Since these two parts of the creative operation are no longer directed and mutually adjusted by the same brain and hand, it is necessary to substitute for this natural and automatic control some artificial arrangement by which on the one hand the author of the design can more or less follow and influence its execution, and on the other hand the executive staff can 'react' on the designer.

This problem is in essence an artistic one, but the practical difficulties of its solution are, as will be seen, mainly technical and economic. The technical difficulties are those offered by the character of the productive process in an industry which has been transformed from a handicraft into a highly complex series of mechanical processes. The nature of these processes must impose more or less rigid and narrow limits on the extent to which the designer can influence execution when once his design has passed into the hands of the operating staff.

The economic difficulties are of two kinds, first those connected with workshop and staff organization and discipline and the definition of responsibilities, which are essential to unified management, and secondly those arising from commercial and marketing conditions which frequently impose on the product the condition of uniformity.

Thus in wholesale and often world-wide

transactions, where sales are effected by sample and description, an essential requirement of the commercial managers of the business is certainty and uniformity—a guarantee that the bulk of the products shall conform to the sample or description on the faith of which they are bought and sold.

This requirement of 'standardization' (i. e. exact conformity to a specification) is an extremely important and formidable factor in the modern problem of industrial art. It is sometimes even assumed that there is such an absolute incompatibility between art and uniformity that it is wrong to call a machine-made product a work of art at all.

The acceptance of such an extreme view would, of course, make it of little use to proceed with our economic analysis, for nothing can be more certain than that standardization, in the sense in which the term is used above, is an inevitable result of the mechanical transformation of industry, and that this condition is destined to play an increasingly important part in the economy of national production. If, then, we accept economic fitness as well as mere technical fitness as a factor in art-value, we shall frequently be bound to regard standardization in this sense as one of the basic conditions of art-value, to be studied and fulfilled, rather than to be shunned as a purely noxious and destructive condition (like, for example, such qualities as insincerity or vulgarity). The exclusion of the results of mass-production from the category of works of art would limit art in the modern world to the rôle of an *art de luxe* having no organic relation to the economic life and structure of society, and little practical interest for the mass of mankind.

Accepting then, as we must, the uniformity of products as an inevitable condition of many branches of machine industry, we have also to accept its consequences, including the rigid limitation of the power of the designer to exercise any effective supervision over the carrying out of his design when once the stage of true commercial production is reached. This does not, of course, mean that the relations between designer and producer are wholly severed, or that there can be no mutual 're-actions' between them. For example, the designer can and frequently does learn much for his future guidance from watching the results of the mechanical reproduction of his designs. Moreover, the situation may be partially alleviated by the tendency which is noticeable in some great industries to divide the productive process itself into two successive stages; the first tentative and experimental, the second definitive and commercial. In the second stage the designer's influence is from the nature of the case either excluded or rigidly limited, and consequently special and increasing importance attaches to the first or experimental stage, the stage in which the designer's suggestions are adapted to the technical necessities of the factory, and in which such reactions between the designing and the executive staff as are still possible under the factory régime must for the most part take place. This also is the stage at which the market is tested by samples before the manufacturer definitely commits himself to large-scale production. Consequently, it is a stage which admits of a certain degree of association and mutual reaction between designer and selling staff, through whose mediation he may be said to establish contact, however indirectly, with the ultimate consumer.

All these difficulties, technical and economic, and the means of overcoming them will need careful and separate examination in connexion with any practical proposals for remedial measures. At present it is sufficient to note their existence, and to observe that their relative weight and importance will be found on examination to vary very widely according to the character of the industry, both as regards the nature of the technical processes and the degree of their subdivision, and as regards the character and fluctuations of the market for which the goods are produced.

Consequently the precise nature of the most suitable practical measures for restoring and maintaining direct contact between designer and executant, and the degree to which success can be attained, are not questions to which any general answer is possible. The answer depends on a minute knowledge of the technique and economic conditions of each particular industry.

Let us now return to our analysis, and endeavour to follow the various stages by which the relations between designer and producer tend to become weakened under modern industrial and commercial conditions. One of the first practical problems of workshop organization that confronts the manager of a large-scale productive business, as soon as the functions of design and execution have been entrusted to separate members of the workshop staff, is how to adjust the proportions of the designing and executive groups so as to constitute a workable economic 'team'. In other words, it is necessary to adjust the relative output so that the flow of designs shall be just sufficient both in volume and in variety to keep the executive staff just fully employed and the market just fully supplied. Before the introduction of subdivision this problem did not arise, or at least it did not obtrude itself on the craftsman's attention. Where the artist himself undertook all or part of the execution of his works the necessary adjustment between designing and carrying out was effected automatically by a variation in the proportion of the artist-craftsman's time that was absorbed by the two functions respectively. Only if this variation exceeded certain fairly wide limits would the result be recognized as wasteful and uneconomic. But the problem which was latent in the case of the artist-craftsman became at once explicit and urgent as soon as the designer and the executant became different individuals.

And, moreover, the problem thus presented is in general insoluble without taking a further step in the direction of separation between design and workshop production. No doubt in exceptional cases a single business may be able to establish the necessary equilibrium between the output of designs and of products by means of a self-contained designing staff, working solely for the business, and capable of supplying exactly the right number and variety of designs to keep the manufacturing staff busy and to satisfy the demands of the different classes of customers at home and abroad. If the scale of production is large, the demand known and fairly constant in quality and quantity, and the industry not subject to rapid changes of fashion, such a type of organization is theoretically possible, and where it is possible it presents important advantages.

But unquestionably under modern conditions, such, for example, as those which prevail in Great Britain and America, the above is the exceptional and not the normal case. Such a type of organization is clearly incapable of being adapted to the case of the smaller businesses which cannot support a full-time designer, or to cases where public demand requires a great variety and frequent changes of design.

The employment of one or two designers will not yield the range of designs which will enable the textile manufacturer to keep abreast with the demand (say) for dress goods. On the other hand, in a trade where new designs are much more sparingly employed in relation to the aggregate production of goods (e.g. china ware) it would need a comparatively large business to absorb the whole output of a designer. Clearly then, in the great majority of cases the economic equilibrium between output of design and output of products cannot be reached within the limits of the same business,

i. e. by any adjustment between the strength of different classes of employees of that business.

Thus the manufacturer has found himself driven by irresistible forces to take a further step in the direction of separation between design and production, by which the relations between manufacturer and designer cease to be those of employer and employee and become those of buyer and seller. Under this system the work of industrial design tends to become a separate business, selling its products (i.e. designs) to the manufacturer, who purchases them like any other materials of his industry. This separate business of designing for the trade may take several forms, from the large organized studios or *ateliers*, which employ a graduated staff of designers, to the 'free-lance' designer who 'hawks' his productions round the manufacturers.

This further process of differentiation between design and execution, i.e. their separation, not into distinct departments within a business, but into two distinct businesses connected only by the relation of buyer and seller, is of the greatest significance for the purpose of our analysis, and indeed probably exercises a profounder influence on the creation of art-values than the primary separation between 'artist' and 'craftsman' which has attracted so much more public attention.

Two results follow, both of great importance from the point of view of industrial art. In the first place the business of 'design' being no longer definitely tied to any particular manufacturing trade, tends to free itself from the restrictions imposed by the technical requirements of special trades, and we get the phenomenon of design 'studios' or free-lance designers turning out so-called 'designs' (or, as they should more properly be called, sketches or motifs for designs) for several distinct industries, e.g. textile printed or woven fabrics, wallpapers, metal-work, or pottery. Economic students will recognize in this phenomenon an illustration of the characteristic tendency in modern industry towards reintegration along the line of similarity of process, rather than of similarity of product. This particular tendency, i.e. for the independent designer to widen his scope and to produce designs for several industries, is not, of course, universal. A large number of designers and design studios restrict themselves to particular industries of whose conditions and requirements they make an intensive study or accumulate an experience, which to a large extent replaces practical workshop training in enabling them to produce designs suitable to the technical conditions of production. Still, even in these cases the range of production for which the studio designer caters is in general much wider than the range open to the designer attached to a particular business, and the degree of familiarity with workshop conditions must *pro tanto* be less.

An important consequence is that the manufacturer, being forced to procure his designs, wholly or partly, by purchase from designers who are not familiar with the special technical and market requirements of his business, finds that a certain proportion, sometimes a large proportion, of the designs offered to him are unsuitable for his purpose without technical adaptation. He therefore tries to overcome this difficulty by employing one or more factory designers or adapters (or, as the Americans term them, 'stylers') whose function is not so much to create new designs as to adapt purchased designs to practical requirements. Sometimes in a large business there may even be an organized staff of workshop designers or adapters, and the head of the staff may, either alone or in conjunction with the head of the commercial or selling department of the business, be entrusted with the selection of the designs to be purchased for adaptation.

It will be seen that we have here reached a still further stage of subdivision, and one of great significance from the point of view of its ultimate artistic consequences. Under the system described the process of designing for a trade is not only divorced from the other processes of production, but is itself split up between two groups of persons, the one independent of the manufacturing business and the other closely attached thereto. We have on the one hand the studio designer who specializes on design as such, but who has not necessarily any technical experience of the particular trade by which his designs are bought; and on the other the workshop designer attached to a particular business who adapts the studio product so as to serve the practical purposes of that business, both as regards technical possibility and market suitability. Under this system of divided responsibility it is sometimes impossible to say which, if either, of the pair is the true author of the design as eventually carried out, and it is obvious that the 'studio' artist who supplied the original *motif* can have no power whatever to influence the execution of his design at any stage, or even its preliminary adaptation by the workshop designer or 'styler'. His part is merely to supply ideas or *motifs* to form the raw material of the 'styler's' product, and his rôle only differs from that played by museum specimens or illustrations or published books of patterns in that the studio artist keeps in close touch with the movements of public taste and fashion, and there is therefore greater probability that the *motifs* he offers, when duly adapted, will find a market.

Economically and artistically the products of the studio designer are not so much finished designs as semi-finished materials for designs, which have to go through an additional stage before the term 'designs' can properly be applied to them.

Of course, in actual fact there are many independent studio designers who have all the necessary technical knowledge and experience to enable them to produce finished designs, i.e. designs which the operative staff of a workshop can execute without the intervention of a workshop adapter. In this matter there is the greatest variety of practice both between different countries, different trades, and different firms within the same trade. But the fact that in certain cases more than one function may be performed by the same person does not invalidate the general analysis, any more than the fact that one man may be works manager and also commercial manager of a business invalidates the distinction between these two functions in industry. The actual degree of subdivision in any particular case depends naturally on the scale of the business.

The whole subject of the relations between studio design and the workshop adapter deserves further study. In every important branch of production dependent on design, in which industrial organization and specialization have reached the stage at which the process of design is normally subdivided between two sets of individuals whose respective functions are to produce *motifs* and to adapt these *motifs* to workshop conditions, it is highly desirable to make an intensive study of the precise nature and limits of these two functions, the mode in which they are performed, and the mutual relations of the individuals to whom they are entrusted.

It is, of course, impossible to lay down any general rule as to the proportion in which the 'art-value' of the resulting design is attributable to each of the partners in its production. Sometimes it may be the workshop adapter who is the real creative artist, the studio designs which he transforms being but the raw materials and suggestions out of which he evolves a work of art, as Shakespeare transformed old tales or plays by his magic touch of genius. Sometimes, on the other hand, the creative work is practically completed in the studio, and the technical adaptation is entirely subordinate, such as a slight modification of scale, arrangement, or colour, to make the design capable of technical or economic execution. There would seem to be an inevitable loss through the subdivision, especially where, as most frequently occurs, the two contributing parties to the production of the design are not in personal touch or communication. On the other hand the specialization of function doubtless tends to develop a higher degree of expert competence within narrow limits, but this is unlikely to suffice to balance the loss arising from subdivision.

A very interesting example of the separation between studio design and technical adaptation to workshop conditions drawn from a branch of production which is not highly subdivided is afforded by the recent experience of the Royal Mint in relation to designs for medals. I quote from the recently published report of the Deputy Master of the Mint:

> '. . . The difficulty of maintaining a high artistic level with our medals, as also with our coins, has arisen from the gradual disappearance of the old art of engraving on the steel or other matrix direct, and the lack of experience on the part of the sculptors and other plastic artists who, with the aid of the reducing machine, have so largely replaced the engravers.' . . . Up to 1902 'the engraver was responsible for taking the drawing or model of the artist, and, where necessary, in consultation with the artist, for making such

adaptations as might be required in order to produce a satisfactory coin or medal. Since that date, however, it has been the practice to go to the artist direct and to be satisfied with the very literal interpretation of his model which results from the use of the reducing machine. It was clear that, in this way, an important connecting link had gradually come to be omitted and that good results from the artistic point of view could only be obtained, either by doing something to revive the art of direct engraving, or by giving facilities to the outside sculptor or modeller to keep in the very closest touch with his work as it left the reducing machine and proceeded through the various stages at the Mint towards the production of the finished coin or medal.'[1]

The development of studio designing as a separate business from practical manufacture has had certain very important results, which we now proceed to study.

(1) The business of designing being no longer tied to the business of manufacture and the task of adapting the *motifs* produced by the studio designer being thrown on to the workshop adapter, there remains no apparent economic necessity for the work of design and of manufacture to be carried out in the same geographical area, and consequently the production of studio designs tends to gravitate to localities which are most favourable for this form of production exactly as manufactures have tended to

---

[1] Fifty-third Annual Report of the Deputy Master and Comptroller of the Royal Mint, 1922 (pp. 8 and 9).

settle in areas presenting special economic advantages. Thus the climatic and still more the social and economic conditions and 'atmosphere' of Lancashire, which are so favourable for cotton manufacture as to give this district a quasi-monopoly of some branches of the trade, are by no means equally favourable to the success of the textile designer, who craves not only for clearer atmosphere and sunnier skies, but still more for the stimulus to creation which only a centre of artistic traditions and sympathies can supply. In modern times the traditions and social and physical conditions favourable to design are found more in France than in England or the United States, and many industries in both the last-named countries are therefore at present largely dependent on the studio designers of Paris for the *motifs* of their designs. The degree of international interdependence varies naturally according to the particular branch of industry. To take, for example, the textile trades, designs for women's dress goods are subject to the changes of fashion originating in the costume trade, of which Paris s the centre, and the influence of the Paris *atelier* on these designs is consequently much more powerful than on the designs for furnishing fabrics (curtains, carpets, chair coverings, &c.) the life of which is much more prolonged and which depend on the whole mode of interior decoration and furnishing of houses—an art which is much more stable and national in character than that of women's costumes.

The whole problem of international interdependence in the matter of industrial design, its causes and consequences, needs much more careful study in relation to each group of industries than has yet been devoted to it in this country.

As regards America a most interesting study of the dependence of art industries on Europe and especially on France has recently been made by a Committee representing the Department of Education of the State of New York and the National Society for Vocational Education. The results, which deal solely with New York State, are summarized in a Report entitled *Art in Industry*,[1] edited by Professor Charles Richards, which is of great interest from our point of view, seeing that the tendencies of American industry towards mass production and subdivision of function are even more pronounced than in the Old World. It is to be hoped that an equally detailed objective study of the present position in Great Britain will be made. In the meantime it may be noted that a necessary result of the development of studio design as a separate industry from that of the manufacture for which the designs are intended, is that the local distribution of the two industries tends to be quite different, and that important manufacturing industries of one country may depend for their artistic *motifs* on a distant source which frequently is not situated within the same country or even in the same cultural area. The dominance of Paris over a British art industry means more from the cultural point of view than merely giving that industry the advantage of access to her clearer skies and her more sympathetic atmosphere. It means that the dominant cultural influence will be Gallic rather than English, with all that this implies.

---

[1] Published by the Macmillan Company, New York (1922).

(2) The actual structure and economic organization of the 'studio design' industry within itself presents a subject of study which is of far more than merely academic interest. Like ordinary manufacture we find this industry carried on by undertakings of very different scale operating side by side, from the single individual designer (the so-called 'free-lance' designer of the American report) up to the large and highly organized studio-workshop with a graduated staff and (at least in some cases) an embryonic subdivision of function.

Some Paris *ateliers* are controlled by British firms or combinations, and produce designs solely for their consumption.

It is noteworthy that rightly or wrongly the authors of the remarkable American Report already alluded to, look to the development of organized design studios in America on the European model as the best hope of improving the standard and quality of American 'art in industry'. Accepting the divorce of the designer from actual manufacture as inevitable, and finding in practice that the system of individual 'free-lance' designers is highly wasteful of artistic talent, and provides no organization for the absorption, training, and gradual advancement of learners, they regard the organized 'studio' as capable of playing a part approximating as nearly as modern economic conditions permit to that of the 'craft workshop' of the guild period of industry. The passage is worth quoting in full:

> 'In a large sense the commercial studio of design bears a striking resemblance to the craft workshop of the guild period of industry. In such a workshop a master craftsman was also the master merchant. He bought his own raw material, transformed it in his shop with the aid of a few journeymen workmen and one or two apprentices, and finally sold the finished product in the market. In no other period in the development of industry has the apprentice had a natural place save in this. Here in the small shop with its

stable conditions, it was not only to the master's interest to impart the best possible training to the apprentice, but he was placed in the best possible position to accomplish this. These conditions have disappeared from modern industry. . . . The design studio, however, almost reproduces these conditions of the older day. The head of such a studio is both the master craftsman and the master merchant. His raw material consists of ideas. Through skill and knowledge these are transformed and materialized to meet the requirements of modern production. These resulting commodities he sells as a master merchant in the market. Such a studio presents almost the same opportunity for training as that of the old-time craftshop of the guild.'[1]

The context of this passage shows clearly that the authors were under no illusion that the picture they had drawn corresponded to the actual facts of industry in America at the present day. It is rather an aspiration for the future, which they regard as possible of realization only if the design studios are controlled by 'men who possess great artistic and practical ability as well as high ethical standards', and also, if I rightly understand the report, if there is such an adjustment of the relations between the commercial studio and the art school, that there is a regular flow of students from the one to become learners or apprentices in the other. I postpone for the moment any attempt at a critical estimate of the soundness of the very interesting conclusion at which the authors of the New York Survey have arrived, or its possible application to our own country. But unquestionably the fact that development along a certain line has commended itself to so competent a body as the New York Committee as likely to afford the best solution of the central problem of industrial art as far as America is concerned, invests this particular line of development and the type of organizations to which it relates with a high degree of practical interest for the purpose of our study.

---

[1] *Art in Industry*, p. 484.

It has been pointed out above that industrial design as a more or less independent industry tends in the first place to centralize this industry in countries and cultural areas which are most favourable to its successful growth. Thus the first effect is to invest international subdivision of industries and economic relationships with a higher degree of complexity. The competition between art industries and the consequent interaction of art cultures may be no longer bilateral but triangular. Country *A* exports products to country *B*, of which the art-value is a varying blend of the *motifs* furnished by the design studios of a third country *C*, and the adaptation of those *motifs* to local and technical conditions by a designer of country *A*. This state of things might mean, though of course it does not necessarily mean, the complete artistic subordination of country *A* to country *C* so far as this particular branch of export trade is concerned. The precise economic and artistic relationship between the two countries *A* and *C* may vary both in kind and degree by almost infinite gradations. Very much depends on the question where the real economic and artistic 'initiative' lies. There are cases in which the initiative rests with the designers, who send their designs to be carried out in another country either because it possesses better technical facilities for the manufacture or because the cost of production is lower. For example, before the war British designs were often sent to Germany, Austria, and elsewhere for reproduction by chromo-lithographic or other colour process, but the initiative and control remained in Great Britain. Again, in the matter of women's costumes the 'initiative' is mainly in Paris, though the Paris models are copied and multiplied by British and other foreign dressmakers.

In the case of textile fabrics much depends on the character and destination of the trade. In the matter of materials for women's costumes for use in western countries the artistic initiative is necessarily dependent on the fashions for costumes, and hence tends more or less to be localized in Paris. But in this case the ‘economic’ initiative tends to be separated from the ‘artistic’ initiative. Thus it is not an uncommon practice for large Lancashire firms to retain the exclusive services of particular designers working in France, and the Calico Printers’ Association has its own *atelier* in Paris.

As regards dress fabrics for export to overseas countries whose cultural conditions are widely different from those of Western Europe, e.g. to the Far East, India, or Africa, the initiative lies with the country by which the export trade is organized and in which the conditions and tastes of these distant markets are subjected to intensive study. For the purpose of preparing designs for such markets Lancashire exporting houses may and do to some extent avail themselves of the skill of foreign designers, but they prescribe within narrow limits the conditions which the designs must fulfil, in accordance with their own knowledge and experience of market conditions.

In the case of furnishing fabrics for use in western countries the artistic and economic initiative lies mainly, and probably to an increasing degree, in the country of actual manufacture and consumption.

Even in the case of fabrics for women’s dress in western countries, where the dominance of Paris is most complete, there have recently been signs of change which, if it continues, may have important results in enabling national taste in the country of manufacture and consumption to exert a freer influence on fashion designs than has previously been possible. The tendency referred to is to substitute a choice between two or more fashion styles for the former insistence on a single fashion. It is too soon to judge whether this is a permanent tendency which will develop further, or a mere transitory experiment.

The importance of the whole question of fashion in relation to design will be better appreciated when we come to discuss the problem of the evolution and blending of styles. (See Chapter VI.)

It is desirable at this point to pause and to distinguish carefully between the essential and inevitable results of the economic forces we have been analysing, and the accidental and modifiable results which have in practice been observed. We may recall that the fundamental reason for the substitution of relations of buyer and seller for those of employer or employed as between the manufacturer and the designer has been the practical difficulty of adjusting in any other way the flow of output of the designer to that of the executive staff. The tendency towards separation has no doubt been strengthened by the preference of the artist for working under the freest conditions and in the most sympathetic atmosphere. But there is no necessary reason why the liberty of the artist should not be safeguarded while still retaining his status as an employee, and in fact cases are not uncommon in which manufacturers make careful arrangements for this purpose. Still, generally speaking, there is little doubt that under modern commercial conditions the designer usually prefers to be independent of the manufacturing business for which he furnishes designs, and this preference is one of the bulwarks of the *atelier* system.

It has been tacitly assumed above that the original source or fount of the *motifs* which are bought by the manufacturer and adapted by his workshop 'designers' to the needs of his industry is the 'design studio' from which he makes his purchases. Of course, this assumption does not correspond at all closely with the actual facts. Not only does the manufacturer often buy *motifs* from the free-lance designer, but the design studio itself, where it has attained the degree of organization which admits of graduation and subdivision of operations, is doubtless also approached by 'free-lance' designers and copyists eager to dispose of their productions, which in turn may have been derived or adapted from Museum examples or illustrated books, or from other sources. To what extent and in what branches of industry the 'design studio' is a self-contained organ of artistic creation, and to what extent and in what branches of industry it is a focus or centre for the purchase and adaptation of the products of outside designers, is a question which would repay careful study. In fact the whole question of the present position and functions and future possibilities of the design studio and its precise relation to the workshop designer is one of the subjects which demand systematic research on scientific lines. For if there should appear to be any widespread tendency for the design studio to develop in the direction not only of primary art creation but also of a 'middleman' between the first creators of *motifs* and the manufacturer's buyer, we might be at the starting-point of a further differentiation and function fraught with grave possibilities either of good or evil.

From the point of view of the American report such an evolution might perhaps be welcomed, and indeed it presents at first sight great attractions compared with the present position. It is possible by the exercise of some degree of imagination to conceive of a design organization built up on the 'studio' model, which

164606

would under wise guidance be a sort of ‘university’ of design, acting not only as an organ of original art creation, but also frankly as an organ of absorption, welcoming, selecting, and digesting the art influences received from all manner of sources, and translating the results into forms suited to the various kinds of practical crafts and mechanical methods of reproduction. Such an ideal organization or guild recruited from the best students of the art schools on the one hand, and maintaining a close touch with the needs of practical industry on the other, might, if it could be realized in practice and its stability maintained, afford a solution of some at least of the more urgent modern problems of the relation of design to industry. It might, for example, bridge the gulf between the art schools and manufacturing industry, by providing an organized and graded profession of industrial design within which specialization could be carried to any point desired, and which could absorb learners and hold out to them a career of gradual advancement. It would certainly be an improvement on the haphazard methods by which many manufacturers at present supply themselves with designs, and it might (again on the assumption that its stability could be maintained) tend towards the building up of a living tradition of industrial art capable of reacting to changes in the social environment.

All this is very attractive at least superficially, but a closer examination reveals very serious flaws in such a scheme for the solution of the modern problem of industrial design.

In the first place it is to be noted that so far from tending towards a reunion between design and manual execution, such a development would constitute a further step in the direction of a complete divorce. The whole business of design would become an organized and graduated industry in itself, independent of the workshop, and even the slender threads which still connect the individual designer with manufacturing processes would be severed. The manufacturer's buyer would be face to face, not with an individual designer, but with an impersonal design-supply organization, and this organization would be likewise interposed between the workshop and the art schools. And while it is true that such a design guild as is contemplated in the above paragraph might afford an attractive career under sympathetic conditions to the artist desirous of taking up industrial design as a profession it is by no means certain or even probable that the guilds would be located within the manufacturing country, or that the resulting benefit would accrue to the art or artists of that country. It is in fact one of the weakest points of the scheme, looked upon as a general solution of the design problem and not merely as a local or sectional experiment to be attempted under specially favourable conditions, that it offers no means of counteracting the deep-seated causes which tend to concentrate industrial design (so long as it is not tied to manufacturing industry) in countries where the conditions of art creation are or are considered to be most favourable. It is difficult to see why a British manufacturer, accustomed to buy his designs from a completely independent source, should prefer to give his custom to a British instead of to a foreign design studio or guild, unless of course its output presented some obvious advantage either of superior quality or lower cost. In other words, there is no apparent reason why the developed organization of independent guilds of design should not be as firmly localized in a foreign country as is the business of studio-designing at the present time. In these circumstances it would obviously do little to supply a career for British designers, nor would it tend to diminish the present unhealthy dependence of British manufacture on foreign *motifs*.

It is of course theoretically conceivable, though practically very improbable, that the development of design as an organized business might attain such a strength that the economic control or initiative in the matter of production might pass from the manufacturer to the design-organization itself. In this way a new synthesis between design and manufacture might be reached, based on the control of manufacture by the design organization, instead of the control of design by the manufacturing organization. There are already great branches of industry (e. g. the cotton trade) where the manufacturers have with rare exceptions lost all influence over the design of their products, which is dictated to them by the exporting merchant by whom they are virtually controlled, and who himself both employs a designing staff and purchases designs from outside sources. But this is only possible where the financial control of export is also exercised by the merchant capitalist, and a synthesis between design and industry which presupposes similar financial strength on the part of the design-organization is so far beyond the range of practical politics that a solution of the problem on this basis does not require serious consideration.

The only possible alternative that remains for examination is the strengthening of the tie between manufacture and design, by developing the importance of the function of the workshop designing staff.

In considering this alternative we must reject any idea of basing modern industry on the artist-craftsman who is at once designer and executant. There is, and must always remain, an important field for the artist-craftsman in crafts and industries which are not of the modern type as defined at the beginning of this chapter. Moreover, in relation to modern industries the pioneer and experimental work of the artist-craftsman is of the highest value. But though it is very important that the artist-craftsman should be preserved, the main problem of art in modern industry must be worked out in other ways. It is impossible at this stage of industrial development to put back the clock, and to revert to a system of small-scale handicraft production, and the 'artist-craftsman' solution cannot be made to fit the conditions of large-scale industry.

Nor should we cherish the illusion that it is possible by any development of workshop design to make every separate business self-contained in the matter of design, and to supersede altogether the practice of purchasing designs from outside sources. Even were it possible to achieve such a result the economic situation created would be essentially unstable. For the disruptive forces which originally led to the development of studio design as a separate business are still operating as strongly as ever, and would in the long run again produce the same inevitable result.

This, however, does not mean that no progress can be made along the lines we are now considering. Though we must admit that large-scale enterprises producing for a distant diverse and fluctuating demand cannot as a rule be completely self-sufficing in the matter of design, it may nevertheless be possible for them to modify very materially the relative extent to which they rely on their own design staff and on independent studio designers for the supply of their needs. There is, in fact, reason to suspect that in some branches of industry the tendency to rely on purchased designs and to limit the workshop designer to the rôle of a technical adapter has far outrun the limits fixed by real economic necessity. There may be a very wide difference indeed between the practical effect of the present system and that of an alternative method of organization under which the workshop designing staff would be first employed up to the limits of their capacity to create original designs, the studios being only relied on as a 'second string' to supply the marginal balance and variety of designs which the exigencies of the business demand. No doubt such an alternative method could only succeed in practice if the level of capacity and training of the workshop designer were greatly improved, and such an improvement could only be attained gradually. But there is plenty of excellent raw material in our art schools out of which competent designers could be evolved, and there is no reason to doubt that an adequate supply of such designers would be forthcoming to meet the demand, provided of course that the remuneration and status offered were sufficiently attractive. Small and struggling firms whose managers have but an imperfect realization of the economic importance of design are likely at first to be sceptical as to the financial results of employing highly skilled and well-paid designers instead of buying designs in the open market. In the case, however, of the larger and the more enlightened firms there will probably be less doubt, especially as the elevation of the workshop designer to the status of an original creator will also greatly assist in the judicious exercise of his present functions as selector and adaptor of such *motifs* as are still purchased from outside.

It is interesting to note that there is already a serious movement along these lines among some of the leading houses in the Manchester textile trade, and without dogmatizing or attempting to generalize from insufficient data we may reasonably expect that an intensive study of the conditions in other industries would disclose a similar tendency. How far the tendency is likely to go, or is inherently capable of going in any particular branch of industry, depends of course on the special conditions of that industry. All that can be said at present is that among the various alternative schemes that have so far been considered this is the one which seems on the whole to offer the greatest chance of practical success in a country situated like Great Britain at the present time. And it has the crowning attraction that though its practical application will be necessarily partial and gradual, it does not violate any fundamental principle or involve any compensating disadvantage.

It remains to summarize very briefly the conclusions arrived at in this chapter.

We have traced the successive stages by which a separation has grown up since the industrial revolution between design and industry. The separation has been successively (1) technical—the range of influence of the designer being rigidly limited by technical consideration; (2) economic—the function of design tending more and more to be performed by independent designers or organizations of designers selling their products to the manufacturing business; (3) geographical—the local distribution of the business of design no longer coinciding with that of the manufacture which absorbs its products; (4) national and racial —design and manufacture often gravitating to different countries presenting different cultural conditions.

Realizing that these disruptive tendencies must cumulatively result in a serious diminution of the art-value of the products, and lead to an unhealthy dependence of national industry on foreign design, and that unless corrected they make impossible the restoration of a living national art culture, we have sought to examine various alternative methods of meeting the situation which has arisen.

Putting aside Utopian solutions, which imply a reversion to handicraft industry, or the control of manufacture by Guilds of Design, we are left with two alternative lines of advance, based respectively on the development of the independent design studio, and of the designing staff attached to the workshop. The former of these alternatives, though presenting attractive features, was found on examination to involve grave drawbacks, as a solution of our own national art problem, since it would constitute a further step in the process of disintegration between design and industry, without affording any remedy for our industrial dependence on foreign design. There remains then only the second alternative, viz. the strengthening of the workshop designing staff, and the improvement of its quality and status, so as to be capable of original art creation as distinct from adaptation. The workshop designers would then naturally be looked to for a greater and greater proportion of the designs required by the industrial business to which they are attached, while the purchase of outside designs would be gradually limited to the margin necessary to meet the exigencies of a fluctuating and varying demand. No doubt there are formidable obstacles which stand in the way of a rapid development along these lines, and further intensive investigation is necessary before the extent to which progress is possible in the case of each branch of industry can be definitely ascertained. But such evidence as is available points to this line of approach to the problem as being that which in the existing circumstances of Great Britain presents the best prospect of a successful advance.

CHAPTER IV

ECONOMIC FITNESS AS A CONDITION OF ART-VALUE

We have seen in the first chapter that fitness for function is an essential element in art-value. By this of course is not meant that every product which is well fitted to fulfil a useful purpose is *ipso facto* a work of art, but that no product can properly be called a work of art in which the condition of fitness is not present, and that its art-value depends *ceteris paribus* on the degree of its fitness. A work of art is a 'function' of many variables, of which fitness for purpose is one. Doubtless most of those who accept this proposition are thinking wholly or mainly of *technical* fitness, as for example that the epithet 'artistic' cannot rightly be applied to a piece of furniture whose drawers or cupboards will not properly open and close, or a teapot which will not pour, or the handle of which comes off.

The subject of technical fitness, all important as it is as a factor in art-values, is clearly one which cannot be appropriately treated in detail in an economic and non-technical discussion.

It is a matter which can only be properly explored in connexion with practical training in art and technology, and must therefore be left to the schools and institutions and technical hand-books which are specially concerned with this training.

There is, however, another sense in which the term ‘fitness’ may be used, i.e. we may speak of ‘economic’ as well as ‘technical’ fitness. For example, a curtain may be of the finest materials and the most exquisite pattern, but its price may place it entirely beyond the means of all but a very few purchasers. Or an ointment pot may be wrought so elaborately and adorned with such costly jewels as to give rise in our minds to an irrepressible feeling of unsuitability—of discordance between the extravagant expenditure of human effort and the trivial ends to which it is devoted.

Ought this quality of ‘economic’ fitness or unfitness to be taken into account in assessing ‘art-value’? To put the question more precisely, ought the ideal jury of experts imagined in a previous chapter, whose verdict is to determine the ‘art-value’ of a given article, to subtract marks if there is evidence that the article can only be produced at a cost which either places it beyond the reach of a great majority of consumers or is out of proportion to the importance or rank of the function which the article is designed to serve? I can imagine an argument being put up by some critics that these considerations ought not to weigh at all with our imaginary jury, whose task (it would be argued) is complete when they have duly taken into account the beauty and utility of the article, including its capacity to fulfil the purpose for which it exists, whatever that purpose may be. The extent to which, in any given circumstances, the limited purchasing power of the mass of the population either permits or forbids them to acquire a work of art is (it would be urged) irrelevant to its art-value. It is a purely economic question with which an art jury cannot properly be concerned. Similarly the question whether a purchaser is or is not justified in expending a large sum or a large proportion of his income on a work of art which has but a trivial purpose is an ethical question or possibly a mixed question of ethics and economics. In any event the decision of this question should not affect the determination of the inherent 'art-value' of the article.

On the other side it may be urged with great force that a conception of art-value which admits technical fitness as one of its determining factors, while at the same time rejecting economic fitness as irrelevant, is inconsistent and incomplete. It admits the 'relativity' of art-value in respect of technical utility, but not of social utility. The disapprobation which admittedly is felt for the extravagantly lavish expenditure of labour, skill, and precious materials on an object whose purpose, even though innocent, is ignoble, cannot be explained wholly as a moral judgement. It is also, in part at least, an aesthetic judgement—a feeling that the rule of 'fitness' (*τὸ πρέπον*) has been violated. The use of 'dignity' as a term of commendation and 'vulgarity' as a term of detraction in connexion with works of art is in itself proof that we do in fact allow our aesthetic judgements to be affected by considerations of economic fitness. Similarly the fact that a beautiful and useful article can be produced at a low cost which places it within the reach of all is not merely an irrelevant economic fact, but one which is justly and inevitably regarded as enhancing its real art-value. The favourable impression made on our judgement by conformity to economic environment and conditions does not differ in kind from that made by conformity to the technical conditions of production or use.

Personally, I regard the argument for admitting economic fitness as one of the factors of art-value as unanswerable, though the practical application of this test requires considerable caution and restraint. Each individual has his own preconceived ideas as to healthy and unhealthy economic conditions, and still more as to what constitutes a noble or ignoble object of human endeavour, and he will naturally be tempted to apply his own individual ethical and economic standards of judgement to the assessment of art-values. Obviously the result of such application would be chaos, and all hope of arriving at a generally accepted standard of art-values would be imperilled. The distinction between the 'social' standard of art-value fixed by applying in a catholic spirit generally accepted tests of quality and fitness, and the 'individual' standard fixed by personal taste and appreciation is a distinction which goes very deep, and which applies equally to all the measurable factors of art-value, and not merely to the factor of economic fitness. It explains, for example, much that otherwise may appear whimsical and inconsistent in Ruskin's artistic judgements, which are sometimes the expression of his personal preferences, sometimes a considered verdict founded on a wide basis of evidence and research. Or again, Professor Lethaby in his essay on modern German architecture, after holding up for our guidance and imitation the efficiency and energy shown by the Germans in city-building, suddenly asks himself, 'But do you like it?' and replies, 'Well, I don't' . . . but 'they were not built for me to like'.[1]

It might even be safer to eliminate the factor of economic fitness altogether from our estimates of art-value than to allow our judgements to be swayed unduly by our personal tastes and preferences, which are affected by association, affection, racial national or local sympathy or antipathy, and a thousand other elements.

Probably in practice our ideal jury would be well advised not to attempt the impossible task of graduating art-value nicely to precise variations of economic fitness, but merely to take off marks for any flagrant failure to comply with generally recognized canons of fitness, by reason of excessive cost in relation either to the general level of purchasing power, or to the intended function of the product. They would, for example, be safe in admitting a higher degree of costly elaboration in a cathedral or civic palace than in a private house or stable, in a chalice than in a drinking mug, and in the 'Pala d'Oro' than in a cigarette case or scent bottle.

The conception of 'economic fitness' as a factor in art-value gives a new insight into one of the other technical conditions of art-value which in a previous chapter was termed the ‘Law of Congruity’, i.e. the principle that a work of art gains part of its art-value from conforming in its design and construction to the limitations imposed by the materials and means of production.

---

[1] *Form in Civilization*, p. 105.

In the introductory chapter I was content provisionally to derive this principle from the consensus of artistic opinion, but it evidently has also a definite economic basis. It implies that all purely wasteful expenditure of effort or material (e.g. the excessive toil or skill required to execute a design in an inappropriate material or without the aid of the most suitable tools) is not merely lost, but actually detracts from the art-value of the resulting product. Looked at from this point of view the law of congruity has affinities with the economic principle of elimination of waste. But in relation to art-value the motive for economizing power and material is heightened by the artistic consideration that the superfluous cost counts negatively, and not only as zero. If now we combine the principle of congruity thus explained with the principle of ‘economic fitness’ which is now under discussion, we seem to descry more or less dimly a possible law of art production somewhat analogous to the ‘Law of Least Action’ in mechanics, or the ‘Law of Least Effort’ in ordinary economic theory. Such a law might be tentatively formulated as follows:

‘Other conditions being equal, the art-value of a product is maximized if the result is obtained at the minimum of economic cost.’

It should be clearly understood that this formula is thrown out rather as a suggestion to stimulate thought than as a statement of an established law. The whole subject needs much further exploration before we can dogmatize with safety, and many pitfalls await the hasty theorist. Without, however, claiming for the suggested ‘law of least cost’ the validity of a proved proposition, it is permissible to point out that some of the results to which it leads are in consonance with general experience.

Thus our appreciation of a work of art is certainly heightened by recognizing that the admired effect is produced by simple means. Other things being equal we do in fact prefer a colour print, a tissue or a carpet in which a beautiful result is reached with the aid of a minimum number of colours, or a simple form of weaving. To analyse the psychological reasons for this preference would lead us too far afield. But we may hazard the conjecture that they are intimately connected with another observed fact of experience, which at first sight may seem contradictory, viz. that an important element in the appreciation of a work of art is admiration for the power and skill of the artist or craftsman.

It may appear at first sight that this principle must lead to results precisely the opposite of the law of least cost. Power and skill are mainly shown in overcoming difficulties, and the greater the difficulties of material and the complexity of processes the greater will be the apparent reason for appreciating the power and skill which have successfully grappled with them, and consequently the greater will be our admiration for the work of art. But the paradox is only apparent and not real. The power and skill which rightly call forth admiration are those which are wisely directed to the overcoming of essential difficulties. A work of art is in no way more admirable merely because the artist or craftsman has successfully surmounted barriers which have been artificially erected by him in order that his powers may be displayed. On the other hand, there is no more striking evidence of power and skill wisely directed than is afforded by the achievement of a given end with the minimum of wasted effort.

An interesting illustration is afforded by the ancient but now almost forgotten art of 'glyptics'—the difficult art of carving very hard stones—usually precious or semi-precious stones. A recent number of the *Studio* contained a notice of this art in which it is stated that 'there is no stone hard enough to resist the instrument of the glyptist'. Portraits and engravings have in the past been carved on diamonds, sapphires, emeralds, and topaz. Among the reasons for the decay of the glyptic art are mentioned the two facts (which are, of course, closely connected) that 'it cannot be patronized except by wealthy individuals in wealthy countries', and that 'the hardness and value of the material prevent many craftsmen from venturing upon this branch of art in modern times'.[1]

It does not enter into the scheme of this inquiry to criticize any particular form of art-expression, but it certainly seems open to doubt if the ancient art of carving precious gems could ever rank among the flourishing arts of a healthy modern civilization, which has a due sense of 'economic fitness'. On the other hand, the modern attempt now being made at Prague to revive the art in a modified form by employing less costly and intractable materials is one which will be watched with interest.

The whole subject, however, of the relations between effort and art-value is, as I have already indicated, full of traps for the unwary. In particular the prime condition 'other things being equal' is so easy to stipulate, and so difficult in practice to ensure. Clearly the law of least cost, hastily and superficially applied without regard to all the necessary qualifications, may lead to dangerous misconceptions. While, therefore, believing that the line of thought here suggested is worth further exploration and that the result may be a proposition of cardinal importance in the economic theory of art-production, I do not propose to follow this tempting by-path any further at present. For the time being it is prudent to restrict ourselves to the vaguer and more general proposition that the economic fitness of a product in relation both to the function it is to fulfil and to the general purchasing capacity of the consuming public is one of the factors to be taken into account in estimating art-value.

---

[1] *Studio*, November, 1923, p. 271.

It may not be superfluous to point out that such a relationship as is suggested above between art-value and economic cost is entirely different from (though not inconsistent with) the converse law of the dependence of ordinary market price on art-value. Though many elements other than art-value enter into market price it is evident that it is one of the factors which determine demand and which, through demand, influence price. The discussion in the ordinary economic text-books of the factors which determine the price of works of art, according as they are or are not capable of being reproduced, is almost the only recognition of works of art in such text-books, and the usual discussion treats such works merely as one particular case of rarity-value.

Those who deny the proposition that art-value depends *ceteris paribus* on economic fitness are driven to the conclusion that the art-value of an object is independent of the ends which it is destined to fulfil, provided that it is technically fitted to fulfil those ends whatever they may be. They are also driven to admit that it is quite indifferent from an artistic point of view whether a work of art is capable of being enjoyed by all, or whether owing to economic impediments it can only minister to the luxury of a few rich men. Such a conclusion is the less acceptable inasmuch as the distribution of artistic appreciation in the population does not in any way correspond to the distribution of material wealth. Hence the limitation of enjoyment of works of art to a small section of the community, selected not by high capacity for appreciation but merely by high capacity to purchase, must necessarily tend to deflect and debase the art standard of demand. This debasement must exercise an injurious effect on those reactions between art production and economic environment which (as will be seen in a later chapter) are the main economic source of the evolution and variation of artistic styles.

No one was more keenly sensible than William Morris of the inherent contradiction between certain features of the revival of English arts and crafts, which he initiated, and the social and economic conditions of the mass of the English population at the time. His own art production, magnificent as it was, was predominantly an *art de luxe*, and so far as its patrons were private individuals they were mostly persons far above the average in riches. This was certainly not because the prices charged were excessive, but because the works were essentially costly to produce. There is evidence in Dr. Mackail's *Life of William Morris* that the contradiction was to him a continual source of disquiet. His own proposed solution was not to reconcile his art work to the necessities imposed by current conditions (that would probably have seemed to him a debasement of art), but rather to bring art within reach of the mass of the people by a total change in their economic position. This was to be effected by what he looked on as the only practicable method—a revolutionary upheaval which would destroy existing society and give birth to a new organization in which he trusted that a new democratic art would flourish. He accepted as inevitable the complete extinction of existing art as part of the destructive process, looking forward to a glorious resurrection in a happier and more sympathetic environment.

The best modern thought, however, looks very distrustfully on Utopian and catastrophic solutions of economic, social, or moral problems—solutions which often spring from irrational pessimism as to present possibilities combined with equally irrational optimism as to possibilities in a future state. Modern thought is evolutionary rather than revolutionary, and tends rather to put its confidence in the law of continuity, and the cumulative effect of small changes brought about gradually by continuous mutual reactions.

The adjustment between art and economic life is very unlikely to be effected either by suddenly revolutionizing economic conditions to make them conform to present-day art standards, or by suddenly revolutionizing present-day art standards to make them conform to current economic limitations. The adjustment, if it comes at all, will be bilateral, not unilateral, and it will come as a gradual process of continuous mutual adaptation, not as a sudden or discontinuous revolutionary event.

In order to admit of such evolutionary adaptation as the cumulative result of continuous pressure between the standard of art production on the one hand and the economic conditions of society on the other, it is essential that both sets of conditions should exhibit a sufficient degree both of resisting power and of plasticity. Where the art tradition is either feeble or fossilized, or where the economic structure of society is either rigidly fixed or in process of dissolution, the essential conditions for harmonious adjustment may be wholly wanting. In such circumstances so-called art can only be an unhealthy ‘cult’, uncontrolled as to its vagaries and extravagances, existing side by side with a brutalized national industry without any healthy reactions between the two.

If, on the other hand, the basic conditions of organic life and health and growth are present, the attainment of an harmonious equilibrium in which economic and art conditions interpenetrate and mutually determine each other is always possible or at least conceivable, and the discovery of the surest means of attaining this equilibrium is one of the great practical problems with which we are confronted to-day.

In thus stating the problem, I have assumed, as a matter of common knowledge and agreement not requiring detailed proof, that under modern economic conditions of production in England to-day there is a 'misfit' or serious failure of adjustment between art and industry, which needs to be corrected by conscious effort.

In the last chapter we analysed one aspect of this 'misfit', namely the increasing mal-adjustment between the two essential functions of design and execution. We found that the central difficulty of the problem is the weakening or severance of the links between the source of artistic inspiration and the actual work of production, and the consequent decay of their power of mutual reaction. When considering the factor of economic fitness we find ourselves in presence of a somewhat similar situation, arising from similar causes. The advent of the great machine industry with subdivided processes and world markets has resolved production and distribution into a chain of processes, design, manufacture, wholesale distribution, retail distribution, and so forth, carried on by sets of persons whose mutual contact is imperfect or non-existent, with the consequent loss of the power of the ultimate consumer to 'react' directly on the producer, and the serious enfeeblement of the power of any single factor to influence the others. Under such complex conditions the forces which in simpler circumstances maintained healthy relations between art production and economic environment have been so impaired that the condition of economic fitness is no longer automatically maintained. Indeed, one of the most distressing features in modern large-scale production is the prevailing pessimism of each separate factor in the chain, as to his supposed powerlessness, either by himself or in combination with others, to achieve any substantial result in raising the standard of industrial art or in securing a better adjustment of production to real economic needs and conditions.

It is desirable, therefore, to face this problem squarely, and to inquire how far this pessimistic attitude is justified.

It is perhaps best for our purpose to take as an illustration the most difficult case, viz. that of an article which is manufactured on a large scale and distributed through various grades of middlemen to ultimate consumers scattered over a wide area—such an article, for example, as pottery ware or printed cotton tissues. Here the responsibility for determining the standards of quality and taste is split up among so many classes and individuals that it is much more difficult to fix it upon any one of them individually than in the simpler case of the artist craftsman making direct for a limited circle of consumers concentrated in the same area.

If in the case taken you speak successively to the designer, manufacturer, wholesale buyer, retailer, and ultimate consumer, each will probably declare and deplore his helplessness to influence the standard of art production, and will pass on the blame for existing defects to some other factor in the complex series of operations, who will equally declare his helpless dependence on others.

This attitude has this element of justification, that no doubt the power of each separate factor to initiate and maintain a permanent change in the level of art production is strictly conditioned and limited by the attitude of each other factor, i.e. by the extent and character of the response which each other factor makes to the movement thus initiated. Nevertheless within these limits it can be demonstrated that each factor has a real power of exerting an influence on the standard of art work, and that if and in so far as any resulting modification elicits a favourable response from other factors, this reaction will constitute a new starting-point for further modifications in the same direction, so that the cumulative results of a succession of changes, each individually small, may be so great as to work a complete transformation. If, on the other hand, there is no response, i.e. none of the other factors react to the first modification, the development will be arrested, and it will depend on special circumstances whether the value of the original limited modifications is maintained, or is partially or wholly lost.

Consider, for example, the case of the ultimate purchaser of the product for consumption. Generally speaking, his first choice is limited to selection among the range of products which he finds in the shops with which he deals. If he dislikes all the examples offered to him he may of course refrain from buying altogether, or seek out some craftsman who will make to his order exactly what he desires. But the former of these alternatives is not usually open in case of articles of ordinary use, and the second alternative is in present circumstances too troublesome, dilatory, and expensive. In the vast majority of cases, therefore, the consumer must choose one of the examples or patterns shown him by the retailer. He therefore declares himself helpless in the hands of the shopkeeper. But though *in the first instance* and at any given moment, the effective power of the consumer to influence the art standard may be confined to choosing among (say) half a dozen specimens brought before his notice, nevertheless in the long run this power may be very effective, especially if the shifting of demand from the lower art-values to the higher is general among the consumers who deal with the shop, i.e. if it is the result of a rise in the general level of artistic appreciation. For the retailer's stock at any given moment is only a cross-section of a continuous flow of goods passing through his hands in the course of the general process of production and circulation. Even if we assume the retailer to be himself untouched by the assumed rise in the level of the consumer's taste, he is bound to be affected by the shifting of demand when replenishing his stock, and the wholesale buyers will similarly take note of the modification, though (on the assumption that their own level of taste is unaltered) they will be in the dark as to whether the shifting of demand is a symptom of permanent change or a mere accidental variation, or a local vagary of fashion likely to be corrected or reversed. If the wholesale buyer is himself by instinct or training readily sensitive and responsive to all indications of improved taste, and capable of discriminating between such symptoms and those of mere evanescent caprice, he will, of course, react much more quickly and intelligently to the impulse from the consumer which is passed on to him by the retailer. But in any case he must in the long run be influenced in his orders to the manufacturer, who in turn will note (more or less promptly and intelligently according to his own trained or instinctive capacity of appreciation) the signs of altered demand and will endeavour to conform his production thereto. If we assume that the manufacturer's response is merely mechanical, and that he himself is still in the dark as to the real source and quality of the change in demand, he will naturally hesitate to incur great expense by specializing on the newly favoured qualities of goods, until time shall declare how far the change of taste is permanent and stable.

But it is to be remembered that the mass of producers in being at any given moment is only a cross-section of a continual flow into and out of the business, which, though much slower than the flow of goods through the retailer's store, is capable, within a comparatively small number of years, of completely transforming the character of productive enterprise. The combined result of all the tendencies set up—the shifting of production on the part of each manufacturer so as to follow so far as practicable the change of demand; the transfer of business towards those manufacturers who are best equipped or most disposed to supply the new demand; and the actual entrance into the trade of new manufacturers specializing on the higher grade goods—cannot fail in the long run, if the pressure is sustained, to be very powerful and far-reaching. But it is clear that the reaction will be very much prompter and fuller if the manufacturer himself is consciously touched by the movement towards raising the standard of quality.

It is unnecessary to recapitulate the above argument *mutatis mutandis* for the cases in which the impulse to improvement originates with the producer or with the middleman instead of with the consumer, as it must be obvious that precisely the same considerations apply, and that the ultimate conclusions are the same in each case.

We may formulate these conclusions as follows:

Where the conditions of production of a work of art are such that the ultimate consumers are widely separated economically and geographically from the producer, and where there is a chain of intermediary distributors between them, the immediate power of any one factor to effect a decisive change in the art quality of production is greatly weakened as compared with the simpler system in which an artist craftsman is in direct contact with a local and limited demand. Nevertheless, the effect of the increased complexity of economic relations is not to destroy the power of any one factor to exercise an effective influence on the resultant product, but only to subject that efficacy to certain limitations and conditions, i.e. (1) at a given moment the range of influence of any single factor is strictly limited, (2) the possibility of one factor exercising a cumulative and permanent influence in the long run depends essentially on meeting with a sympathetic response from the other factors at each stage.

These conditions apply indifferently whether the first impulse comes from consumer, producer, or middleman. The circle of production, distribution, and consumption is no 'vicious circle', but on the contrary progress towards improvement can begin equally at any point of the chain. But for permanent progressive and cumulative effect it is essential that each impulse shall be sustained, and that it shall meet with the appropriate reaction. To ensure this, attention must not be concentrated exclusively on the education of the producer, or of the consumer or of the middleman, but must aim at the simultaneous elevation of the art standard of *all* these factors, so that each may be ready to appreciate and react to any upward impulse from whatever source received. The system under which each factor waits idly and sceptically for others to move first must give way to a healthy rivalry in seizing the initiative, in confidence that this initiative will meet with a response.

The results arrived at in the present chapter may now be very briefly summarized.

An essential element in art-value is fitness for function, and this includes not only technical fitness but economic fitness. Economic fitness includes two ideas, (1) that in the production of a work of art there should be a just and fitting relation between the cost incurred in terms of effort and materials, and the degree of importance, dignity, and nobility of the ends which the work is to serve, (2) that there should similarly be a fitting relation between the cost of the work and the level of well-being or purchasing power of the persons for whose use it is intended. The principle of economic fitness when combined with the law of congruity leads to the conclusion that all pure waste counts negatively in estimating art-value.

In normal times fitting and harmonious relations between scale of cost, dignity of purpose, and economic purchasing power may be more or less maintained by continual mutual reactions between producer and consumer. But in modern industry the increasing complexity of organization has so lengthened the chain of factors in production, distribution, and consumption, as greatly to weaken this power of mutual reaction, and in these circumstances there is liable to be, and in fact there has arisen, a mal-adjustment between art production and economic environment, which presents a serious problem. But though serious the problem is not insoluble, for the power of each factor to influence the others, though less direct and less immediately effective than formerly, is cumulative, and given a sufficient period of time may be decisive, always assuming that the other factors are sensitive, receptive, and responsive. To enhance this sensitiveness and responsiveness and to ensure that each factor in the long economic chain shall select rightly and promptly, among the numberless impulses which he receives, those only which tend towards a higher standard, is essentially a problem of better education and training. Such improved training will produce vastly greater, speedier, and surer effects if applied concurrently to each and all of the factors—designer, manufacturer, wholesale and retail distributor, and consumer —than if confined to any of them singly.

The importance of these results will appear more clearly when we analyse the factors which contribute to the evolution of artistic styles.

CHAPTER V

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOURSE IN WORKS OF ART

The classical economic theory of international values depends essentially on the proposition that the mobility of persons and capital between different States is far less perfect than within the borders of a single State. Almost alone among the masters of economic theory Henry Sidgwick denied that this relative immobility was the real basis and justification of the different economic doctrines of value as applied to domestic and international trade respectively, and he proposed as an alternative explanation the cost of carriage between the frontiers of the trading countries. But Sidgwick's argument, which in effect substituted 'long distance trade' for 'international trade' as the special object of analysis, has had few supporters. It has generally been recognized among modern economists that the special characteristic of international traffic which gives rise to a special theory of exchange values is not the geographical distance over which the trade takes place, or even the fact that between the political frontiers across which international trade passes there may sometimes be an interval of sea or land which has to be bridged. It consists rather in the fact that differences between the political and cultural conditions prevailing in the two trading countries impede the free interchange between them of population and capital. For example, persons who think little of migrating from one part of England to another in response to economic inducements or needs may hesitate to change their allegiance, or alternatively to live as aliens in a foreign country. The groundwork of the theory has been quite recently re-stated by Dr. Marshall :

> 'Migration within a country is facilitated and its adjustments are rendered efficient by various influences which do not favour emigration beyond its boundaries in like degree ; and therefore problems of 'international values' require a different treatment from that which is appropriate to the relative values of things produced in the same country.'[1]

It is important, however, to observe in relation to this theory that the obstructions to the free migration of population and capital between different countries are not only due to their political separation, or to the differences between their methods of government and laws, or between the guarantees of personal security which they offer. They also arise, sometimes to an even greater extent, from differences in those social and economic conditions which may be described by the term 'cultural'. Differences of languages, religion, social characteristics and ways of life, standards of living, cookery, and dress, traditions of thought and art—all these differences or the apprehension of them, may cumulatively exercise a greater deterrent influence on migration than the mere differences of political and legal institutions. Now it will be noted that these classes of deterrent influences follow the lines of cultural rather than of political frontiers, and strictly speaking obstruct 'inter-cultural' movement rather than 'international' movement as such. Though the point has not altogether escaped notice (Dr. Marshall for example refers to the fact that an Englishman migrating to the United States meets his own language[1]) it has perhaps hardly attracted sufficient attention that a certain degree of approximation between inter-cultural and international frontiers is a necessary postulate of the classical theory of international values. For example, it is doubtful how far the theory applies to the case of trade between Canada and the United States, where the cultural conditions on the two sides of the frontier are closely similar, and the political institutions though independent are not radically different. On the other hand, the migration of industrial population between England and (say) India or Nigeria is checked by profound cultural differences which are not overcome by their common allegiance to the same Crown.

---

[1] *Money, Credit, and Commerce*, p. 7.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 9.

The general theory of international exchange values is not of itself of any special interest in relation to works of art, but the interchange of works of art between different countries or cultural areas has important effects on art-values, which deserve our attention.

To understand the situation we must recall the basic fact which was emphasized in the opening chapter that the art-value of every product contains an element, in greater or less proportion, which is dependent on local or cultural conditions, e.g. local associations of a religious, mythological, or historic character, or perhaps local *motifs* of decoration (e. g. the Egyptian lotus, the Cretan octopus, or the Greek acanthus) which lose part of their full meaning or appeal when separated from their native environment and transferred to the alien soil of another cultural field. It should perhaps be repeated, to avoid misconception, that the term 'art-value' as here used has the strictly technical meaning attributed to it in Chapter I, i.e it has no direct reference to 'exchange value', but means the quantitative estimate which an impartial and omniscient jury would make of the artistic quality of the product as compared with other products of a similar class current at the same period in the same cultural area.

Inasmuch therefore as some of the elements of the art-value of a product depend on local cultural connexions, it follows that this art-value however stable within the same cultural area, becomes unstable as soon as the product moves between different cultural fields, or in other words that it depreciates or appreciates as the product crosses inter-cultural barriers.

Generally speaking, the tendency will be towards depreciation as the product travels into a more 'distant' or less kindred and sympathetic cultural field. No doubt from the point of view of the connoisseurs there is also a certain counter-tendency, viz. toward heightening the art-value of a product which represents and interprets a strange and alien art. But this special value (e.g. as museum specimens, collectors' 'curios', or reminders to travellers of distant countries which they have visited) is of such relatively limited importance that it may be neglected for our present purpose.

Thus the first general law which we can formulate with regard to the art-value of a product which is an object of international intercourse is that it depends at any given moment on the degree of affinity between the cultural conditions of the country of origin and those of the country into which it has penetrated. Generally speaking, the art-value varies inversely (though by no means proportionately) with the 'distance' which separates these cultures. It is hardly necessary to say that the term 'distance' is not here used in a geographical sense, but as a measure of the degree of separation or want of affinity between two art cultures.

The second general law is that the 'elasticity' of the art-value of a work which is an object of international trade depends also on the relative importance of the local or cultural elements as compared with the more universal or essential elements which enter into its art-value.

It follows that the depreciation of art-values according to the 'distance' which separates the cultural conditions in the countries of intercourse applies with much greater force to some classes of products than to others. For example, a picture whose value arises mainly from qualities of colour, composition, and texture may preserve its art-value almost unimpaired in a very 'distant' cultural area, while on the other hand such part of the value of a religious work of art as is derived from symbolical suggestion or pictorial representation of religious motives or history peculiar to the cultural area of its origin may be greatly reduced or even wholly lost by transference to an area where this religious system is unfamiliar, and its history and symbolism excite but the faintest interest.

This reasoning may seem abstract and fanciful and with little relation to practical life and problems. As a matter of fact, however, the law of instability of art-values when a work of art is transplanted from one cultural area to another is a principle of high practical interest the neglect of which leads often to lamentable results. To take a single illustration. Who that cares for fine building can have failed to notice, perhaps with some wonder, that the most beautiful and satisfying results are so often achieved by the use of local materials worked and combined according to methods and practices hallowed by local tradition? Such buildings (and I include not only dwellings for the living but monuments to the dead), which seem to have grown naturally out of their surroundings rather than to have been artificially placed there, are those on which our memory loves best to dwell. And how forlornly out of place have seemed to us identical buildings or monuments transferred to some region alien to their genius. There could not be a more striking example of the general law of depreciation of art-value as the work of art moves into a culturally distant area. For it is not merely the physical environment—the lie of the country, the sky and climate, and the nature of the locally available materials and resources,—but also, and sometimes to a decisive degree, the cultural environment, the whole tradition and way of life of the people of the district which leave their impress on the local way of building and give it its special character. Thus it is that settlers in far countries have in all ages carried with them their home traditions of building, based on their home cultural conditions; the Greeks into their Mediterranean colonies, the Romans into their provinces. And in modern times the British colonists in North America carried with them what is there still called the 'colonial style', i.e. the way of building houses and churches in eighteenth-century England. In such cases the transplantation may become a fresh starting-point for a new evolution, based on the physical and cultural characteristics of the new country. But that is another story, which must be deferred until we discuss the inter-penetration of styles.

Although the real frontiers which affect the distribution and variation of art-values are cultural and not political frontiers, what has been said above applies to a large extent to international intercourse as such, inasmuch as there is always a strong tendency for a political frontier to become also to a greater or lesser extent an intercultural line. This results from the action of a number of forces, e.g. interchange of local populations by migration across the frontier. We see a conspicuous example of this tendency in the present situation in South-Eastern Europe and the Near East, where the rearrangement of political frontiers has been accompanied by mass migrations and readjustments of population, and even in some cases by compulsory exchange of inhabitants, in the effort to harmonize cultural affinities with political allegiance. While for these and other reasons political separation between two countries tends to set up and accentuate cultural differences between them, there is simultaneously a strong tendency to weaken and break down cultural barriers within the same political state. The forces working in this direction are partly unconscious, e.g. the perfection of means of communication, the general diffusion of education on more or less uniform lines, and the levelling of local differences by economic competition and commercial intercourse. But such influences are in some countries reinforced by conscious repression of local cultural differences through legislative or administrative action, intended either to strengthen national unity or to satisfy the sentiment of equality and uniformity. In countries of Western Europe most forms of characteristic local cultures are decaying or becoming fused in a single characteristic national culture. In countries where, as in the Near East, cultural differences are still deep and sharp, we have the terrible question of 'minorities' which is so perplexing to statesmen and to the League of Nations.

From all these causes political entities tend to become cultural entities. Whether, however, we prefer to speak of international or of intercultural intercourse we must never forget that fundamentally it is the change of cultural rather than of political conditions when the frontier is crossed that is the real determining factor in the variation of art-values. And whenever we speak of national art standards and traditions we are really using the word 'national' in a cultural rather than in a political sense.

Before proceeding with our analysis we must pause to answer a question which naturally suggests itself. If, it may be asked, international intercourse in the products of different art cultures usually results in a depreciation of their art-values, must we not accept the conclusion that from the point of view of maintaining 'art-values' at the highest possible point, a policy of isolation and non-communication is preferable to one of international intercourse?

There appears at first sight much to be said for this conclusion if we take only a momentary view, and ignore the all-important element of time. It is true that to take the art treasures and products of a country out of their proper cultural setting and distribute them among distant alien and unsympathetic cultural areas must for the time being depreciate their art-value, just as the art-value (say) of the jewels and other constituent elements of the famous Peacock Throne of Delhi was depreciated by their dispersion, torn from the setting which gave them significance. But we must beware of judgements founded on short period views. We are familiar with the lamentable spectacle of ancient and indigenous forms of art culture dying before the destructive onslaught of more economically powerful alien competitors. Surely it may be said we are justified in the belief that such a result conduces not to the enrichment but rather to the impoverishment of the world from the point of view of art-values. On the other hand, we cannot fail to notice how frequently the native art, whose disappearance before its foreign assailant we deplore, is already in a condition of weakness indicative of stagnation and arrested impulse if not of actual decay. And it becomes of interest to inquire how far this debility which impairs its power of reacting against foreign influence may be connected with its previous isolation and consequent impoverishment. It is evident that we cannot solve the problem thus presented by merely weighing the immediate results on the world level of art-values produced by the actual contact between two art cultures. We are bound (as in so many problems of economic theory) to consider the results of isolation or intercourse, not at a single moment, but over long periods of time. We have, in fact, to take into account the whole of the conditions affecting the life-history of an art culture—its birth, development, culmination, stagnation, decay, and dissolution, and of the results produced at each of these stages either by complete or partial isolation from outside influence, or by various modes of inter-action with alien art cultures of different types, strength, and degrees of affinity. For example, each of the epoch-making inventions which has caused an ‘industrial revolution', from the invention of metals to that of the steam-engine, has caused an immediate decline in the artistic level of the pre-existing crafts. The introduction, first of copper and then of bronze, was marked by an appreciable falling off in the art of pottery in Mediterranean lands compared with the standard reached in neolithic times. Mr. Hall has noted this falling off, not only in Crete, but in the Cyclades and Egypt,[1] and indeed it can be verified by any visitor to the Egyptian and early vase rooms at the British Museum. The immediate effect on ceramic art of the invasion of Greece by the iron-using Achaeans three thousand years later was to substitute the stiff patterns of the early 'geometric style' for the decadent but still living naturalistic decoration of the 'Mycenaean' age of bronze. But in both cases the set-back was but temporary, and contemporary philosophers would have erred grievously if they had drawn far-reaching inferences as to the permanent effects of the innovation on the art history of the world. For the discovery of metal ushered in the splendid art-epochs of Crete and Mycenae and of the Old Empire of Egypt, while the 'geometric' pottery of the early iron users was a precursor of the Greek vase painting, which is one of the wonders of the world.[1]

---

[1] Hall, *Aegean Archaeology*, p. 72.

It is needless to multiply examples. If (to borrow an example from Chemistry) there is a fall of temperature at the moment of combination this does not mean that the 'art' temperature is permanently lowered. All depends on the properties and energy of the resulting product.

The question between the advantages of isolation or intercourse is not of course of any immediate practical importance, because no modern country or field of art culture can in actual fact remain isolated. There are too many channels through which outside influences must obtain access. Not only are the means of interchange of products and of intercommunication between the creators and consumers of these products organized to a point unknown in any previous age, but the facilities for making any particular art culture and its products widely known through descriptions, illustrations, and mechanical reproductions are such that any attempt to preserve a sort of 'hermit kingdom' of art culture is foredoomed to failure. But though the hypothesis of complete isolation is under present conditions in the western world impossible to realize, there are actual examples of such isolated cultures in the past, and it is possible that the exploration of their life-histories might yield useful lessons in relation to modern problems. On the other hand, the study of the various modes of intercourse between art cultures of different types and of their respective results, including the 'fertility' of the resulting blends, has an immediate practical bearing on present-day problems of industrial art.

---

[1] Of course there were other and powerful influences, mainly from the East, which contributed to the formation of the 'Classical' Greek style of ceramic art.

It will be noticed that in the present discussion we have tended to use such terms as birth, life, death, growth, and decay, which are essentially terms of biological science, instead of the more usual concepts (force, motion, weight, level, and the rest) which economic theory is accustomed to borrow from the physical sciences and especially from statics and dynamics.

It is in fact a quasi-biological problem which we are approaching, and we need not be surprised if we should eventually find that the laws governing the evolution and cross-fertilization of art cultures or styles bear a strong analogy to the biological laws governing organic evolution and the cross-fertilization of animals or plants.

Our conclusion is that we are not justified in inferring from the law of depreciation that international intercourse in works of art tends to depress the aggregate art-values existing in the world—if indeed we can attach any definite meaning to the conception of such an aggregate. For the depreciation of art-value when a product travels to a culturally distant area is but a temporary phenomenon which occurs at the moment of penetration and not a final result, if we take a long period view. That final and permanent result cannot be ascertained until the contact established between the two distant art cultures has had time to develop its full effects. And this development must be studied as a biological rather than as a mechanical problem. Before, however, we can with advantage consider the effects of interpenetration on the blending of art cultures we must first examine in detail the significance of artistic styles, and the conditions which govern their evolution and modification. This is attempted in the following chapter.

CHAPTER VI

THE EVOLUTION AND MODIFICATION OF ARTISTIC STYLES

We give the name 'style' in art to the complex of characteristics technical, traditional, and aesthetic, which mark the way in which a particular class of works of art are customarily produced at a given place and period, and which distinguish it from the way prevailing in respect of the same category of products in some previous or subsequent period or in some other country or district.

We propose to examine the mode in which styles develop and change either by internal modification or by absorbing influences from without.

In either case the process of development and modification depends on two principal factors, (1) the pressure of a changing environment, (2) internal modifications due to conscious choice or unconscious 'bias' on the part of creators of the works of art. We might almost have substituted for this formula the shorter formula so familiar to economists that the process depends on factors connected with demand and supply respectively.

The ‘demand’ factor, i.e. the pressure on the art-producer of changes in human wants, tastes, and desires, is in the long run the most potent factor in the modification of artistic style, because it modifies the fundamental conditions which must be fulfilled by the artist and craftsman, and which therefore limit the forms and media through which their ideas can be expressed. Thus the gradual change of economic, social, and cultural conditions in a country will inevitably produce corresponding changes of artistic ‘styles’. In part this action will be positive, e.g. by directing the craftsman's efforts into new channels, in order to meet new needs or desires. In part it will be negative—a process, in fact, of ‘natural selection’ operating on the countless modifications, small or great, which arise from time to time from the differences of capacity and temperament among the artists or craftsmen themselves. This process of selection ensures that only those modifications shall be permitted to survive which are recognized by the general judgement of the day as being improvements either from the utilitarian or the aesthetic point of view. How far any or all of the modifications thus selected for survival will become the basis of fresh modifications in the same direction, so that a new style can be gradually evolved from an aggregate of successive small changes (as according to the Darwinian theory new organic species are evolved), depends primarily on the question whether the survival is due to some definite superiority or only to a passing fashion or craze for novelty. In the latter case the tendency will be for successive modifications not to be in the same direction, but rather at random, or even in some cases to oscillate backwards and forwards like a swinging pendulum.

No true development of style can be built up from the mere wayward and haphazard movements of passing fashion. Nevertheless, fashion movements are by no means negligible as sources of variations on which the selective process can operate. In fact, these apparently erratic deviations and their relation to the development of styles are of sufficient interest to merit separate attention.[1]

On the other hand, each variation which has stood the test of the selective process as constituting a recognized improvement becomes automatically the basis for a fresh development in a similar direction.

It must not be thought, however, that the influence of demand on style operates only through the accumulated pressure of small

---

[1] See below (pp. 160–3).

‘continuous’ changes. Another important factor is that of ‘discontinuous’ changes caused by definite events, e.g. discoveries and inventions leading to new or modified wants, changes of taste due to the opening up of new connexions with foreign countries, religious or social movements requiring new forms of art expression, &c., &c. This element of discontinuous change (which, as will be seen below, is even more important in the case of the supply factor) bears a certain analogy to the ‘mutations’ associated with the names of De Vries and Bateson as elements in organic evolution, in contrast with the small and continuous variations which are the postulate of Darwinism.

For example, in Egypt the extraordinary religious revolution of Akhnaton was accompanied by a sudden breach with the traditional artistic style of the Theban School, and the temporary ascendancy of a completely new style, based indeed on the craftsmanship of a bygone age still lingering in the provinces, but inspired and transmuted by the new doctrines and ideas. And the re-establishment of the authority of Thebes and the traditional religion a few years later completely effaced the ‘revolutionary’ style of Art which had marked the interlude of heterodoxy. In this case the 'mutation' probably led to no permanent development of style. When, however, the lessons of the recent wonderful discoveries in Tutankhamen's tomb have been fully learnt we may hope to have a deeper insight into the genesis, development, and subsidence of this fascinating artistic 'mutation', and we shall know better whether it left any lasting impress on the official art traditions.

It will be seen that the factors which contribute to change of artistic style from the point of view of demand are very diverse, and only some of these forces are economic in the strict sense of the term. It is, however, clear that among the most potent of all these forces are variations in the amount of purchasing power available for the acquisition of works of art, due to variations in the general economic prosperity and wealth of the community. When an increasing proportion of the energy of the population has to be expended on acquiring the bare necessaries of life, there is an inevitable tendency towards reducing expenditure on works of art, which in turn compels their producers to seek means of reducing the cost of their work, either by simplification or by the use of less costly materials, or by increased subdivision of labour, or by other methods, all of which inevitably involve variations of style.

Conversely any increase of the surplus wealth of a country, i.e. of the margin after satisfying absolutely basic needs, tends, *ceteris paribus*, to stimulate demand for more elaborate and sumptuous works carried out in more costly materials. The American millionaire demand for works of art, regardless of cost, may have a very marked and possibly not altogether healthy influence on the future development of the arts in the United States.

Turning from the demand to the supply factor, we find as before that the forces tending to produce changes in artistic style are partly 'continuous' and partly 'discontinuous'. The 'continuous' element arises from more than one cause. In the first place the human beings by whom alone works of art are produced are not independent of the society and age to which they belong, but are themselves susceptible to the surrounding changes of point of view, taste, and standard which we have already noted in dealing with the factor of demand.

Hence, quite independently of the modifications forced on the producer by the pressure of changes of demand, the producer himself tends more or less unconsciously and spontaneously to vary his style in harmony with changes in his environment. In the next place we must remember that among the products of a large number of artists and craftsmen there will inevitably be many variations, large or slight, dependent on the personal idiosyncrasies of the individuals by which they are created. This element of variation will be very much more pronounced in the case of works of art than in that of other products, because it is precisely the qualities and features in virtue of which a product becomes a work of art that bear most deeply the impress of the individual author's mind. At any given moment this class of variations may be described as 'random' variations not pointing in one common direction, but merely reflecting the infinite variety of human idiosyncrasies. But, as already noted under the head of the demand factor, the random variations which are thus constantly appearing are controlled by the operation of a drastic selective process which only permits the survival of those which point the same way.

But probably the most important of the 'supply' factors in the evolution of artistic style are discontinuous variations or definite events, which again may be classified under two general headings, (*a*) discoveries and inventions of new materials, implements, or processes; (*b*) conscious action and choice by individual artists.

(*a*) Great discoveries, such as the use of copper, bronze, or iron, have had an immediate and definite effect on artistic style by introducing new materials to be fashioned, and new tools wherewith to work. Similarly, such inventions as the potter's wheel and the weaving loom made sudden or 'discontinuous' variations in the corresponding crafts. The discovery (however made) of the pointed arch as a method of building construction was an important factor in the transition from Norman to Gothic architecture. The invention of automatic machinery driven by mechanical power has had a widespread and controlling influence on the whole history of industrial art during the last century and a half.

(*b*) But another important source of 'discontinuous' variations of style is the conscious eclecticism of individual artists. From time to time arises a designer who consciously selects from among the characteristics of different styles and creates a new combination out of the selected elements, which is virtually a new or composite style, or at all events an effort towards reaching such a style. This process of eclecticism differs from the process which we term 'natural selection' in being conscious instead of (mainly) unconscious, and in being a definite or discontinuous event instead of a prolonged and gradual evolution. When the eclectic artist is a man of exceptional power and ability the result may conceivably be the establishment of a new style without going through the usual long process of preparatory development. As a rule, however, the result of the ‘mutation’ will need severe testing by selection before it can be seen whether it presents a stable variety or merely a freak of eccentricity. And it will usually be found that the crucial test of stability is ‘fertility’, i. e. the capacity to serve as a fresh point of departure for fresh variation in the same direction.

In speaking of eclecticism we have touched on one aspect of the problem of the modification of style by combination or intermingling between two different styles, or (again to borrow biological terminology) the problem of cross fertilization. Before we deal more in detail with this problem it is to be observed that the intrusion of a competitive style from without is, and always has been, one of the most potent causes of breach of continuity in the evolution of style. Sometimes it operates through demand, by compelling the native artist to modify his style to suit the change of public taste caused by the foreign importation. Sometimes it operates through supply, by stimulating the native artist to emulate the new models or at least to borrow some of their characteristic features. Sometimes, of course, it completely overwhelms and kills the native style, and there is no combination, but only the destruction and replacement of one style by another.

In the history of the arts most great impulses leading to new development and styles have come from without, and it would seem as if the intermingling and blending of national art cultures were as necessary for the progress and perfection of art as the blending of races for the building up of virile and progressive nations. But neither in art nor in biology are these results attainable by indiscriminate and random mixture. The capacity of giving rise by union to a true and fertile blend is subject in the case of art as in that of living organisms to strict conditions and limitations. What these conditions and limitations are can only be ascertained by a study of actual historic art developments. A preliminary attempt to explore this ground is made in the next chapter, which deals with the interaction of national art cultures.

Before, however, we proceed to consider the intermingling of art cultures and the blending of styles, it is desirable to deal with two points of importance arising out of our study of the evolution of styles.

(1) In the first place let us revert to the

question of Fashion changes, briefly alluded to at the beginning of this chapter.

The fundamental motive behind fashion movements is undoubtedly the desire for change—the weariness caused by monotony. This is probably a very deep-seated motive of human action with a definite physiological basis. Hence, whatever be the stage which the evolution of an artistic style has reached, there will inevitably be countless attempts to vary it, based primarily on the craving for variety. Individual modifications arising purely and simply from this cause would naturally be mere random variations having no definite objective. In the actual world, however, an event is rarely attributable exclusively to a single cause, and while the desire for variety supplies the motive power for the short period changes which we are now considering, the direction of these changes is unquestionably affected by other forces including current art tendencies. These forces give the random variations a 'bias' in certain definite directions, thus causing them to take the form of a short period deviation from the normal trend of the style. Such a deviation is what we mean by a 'fashion'. In certain branches of art production fashion changes are much more clearly marked than others, the direction of the change being not merely 'biased' by the influence of prevailing art tendencies operating on the choice of individuals, but being consciously determined by decisions of some authority recognized as the leader of fashion in these matters. Such an authority may be an individual, a social group, or (perhaps more often in modern life) a commercial group or organization.

One beneficial effect of the control of fashion changes by a social or commercial group or organization is to ensure that successive fashion movements shall be more or less closely linked together in series, and correlated with what has gone before, instead of being purely erratic, and that the wilder excesses of individual aberration shall be held in check. On the other hand, there is an evident danger lest the power of a commercial organization to direct fashion may be abused by the artificial creation of variations corresponding to no natural longing of the public for variety, but forced on them solely in the interest of trade. For this reason any tendency to relax the stringency of fashion control, and to increase the range of effective choice of the consumer is *prima facie* a healthy tendency to be welcomed. (In this connexion reference may be made to the observations on pp. 96–7 as to recent tendencies in the control of fashion in dress fabrics.)

Fashion periods vary within wide limits according to the nature of the article. Thus while women's dress fashions are varied every season, fashions in furniture change much more slowly. Clearly the element of pure caprice is more powerful in the case of very short period fluctuations, while as the period grows longer we reach a border-line where it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the movements of fashion and the normal development of artistic style.

If in the case of any art-form we visualize the general trend of development of style as a curved line on a chart, plotted in terms of some essential quality (such as the intensity of art energy), we may conceive of fashion changes as a connected series of short period deviations oscillating about the main curve of the style.[1]

(2) Secondly, we have to note certain long-period movements or trends which may arise in the course of the life-history of a style.

If, in accordance with the conception suggested above, we regard the undulating curve which represents the genesis, evolution, and decline of a historic art style as being an ideal 'mean' line, about which oscillate short period movements of fashion, so also we must conceive of this curve as representing the mean course taken by a bundle of separate though closely connected elements, which do not move in quite identical directions, and (what is more important) do not all complete their life-history in the same period. For a style usually embraces a number of distinct art-forms, each of which, while conforming generally to the main stream of tendency, is also influenced and to some extent deflected in its movement by the special laws appertaining to its medium of expression or to other technical and economic conditions of its production. Thus the critical points in the curves of evolution of all these different art-forms will not synchronize, and a style may persist in respect of one art-form for a considerable period after it has decayed and perished as regards another.

---

[1] Fashions, however, are not always modified by small and continuous variations from a prevailing type. Sometimes they are changed 'discontinuously' or, as Sir Charles Walston puts it, by contrast rather than by sympathy. See his interesting lecture on 'Fashion in Art and Art-Industry' given before the Royal Society of Arts (see *Journal of Royal Society of Arts*, March 27, 1914, especially p. 411).

The main style-curve is, as I have said, an ideal mean of all these individual movements, but it is important to note that from time to time one or other of the individual elements may detach itself from the main curve altogether and follow a characteristic trend of its own, bearing no relation to the 'mean' movement of the style as a whole. Some of these derivative movements may have a period much longer than that of the parent curve—so much longer in fact as to suggest the analogy of the so-called 'secular trend' in the analysis of economic cycles.

The concrete facts which are the basis of this brief and rather abstract statement are of such great importance in the theory of art development, and their neglect or misunderstanding is so fruitful a source of practical error that it is desirable to pause and examine the matter in greater detail.

It may have occurred to the reader that the picture drawn in the earlier part of this chapter of the evolution of styles—the ceaseless throwing up of variations and mutations, and the ruthless operation of selective forces by which most of these deviations are arrested, while the few survivors become the starting-points for further change and development—gives an exaggerated impression of continual and restless change, an impression which is further enhanced by the conception of continuous short period fashion movements about the 'mean' course of development. Does this continual flux and reflux of styles and fashions, it may be asked, give a true and complete picture of the development of the arts? Or is it possible amid the obscurity and confusion due to these comparatively short period movements to detect any underlying 'secular trend' marking a real progressive advance?

The question thus put does not admit of any general or decisive answer in the present stage of our inquiry. But as a contribution towards an eventual answer it may be said at once that the picture of continual upward and downward movements of styles and fashions requires very considerable qualification before it can be accepted as a true and complete account of artistic progress. For in fact there are resting-places amid the continual ebb and flow of movement, and the evolutionary process is quite consistent with the stabilization of particular forms and types over considerable periods of time. Forms and types so selected for stabilization may survive the death of the style which gave birth to them, and continue to live independently as a beneficial legacy to the world, until in their turn they are themselves displaced by fresh variants, which establish themselves by the test of selection as corresponding more nearly to the real needs and conditions of a changed environment.

An art-form which has thus been selected for survival beyond the life-time of its parent style, on the ground of its permanent and intrinsic merit, is what we mean (or what we should mean) by the term ‘Classic’, though it is to be feared that too often this term is wrongly and indiscriminately applied to any art-forms which were habitually used by the Greeks or Romans.

A ‘Classic’ then is, properly speaking, an art-form which has not only survived the selective process which admits or rejects modifications in the development of a particular style, but which has further been selected by the common judgement of mankind to enjoy a wider and longer influence, outside the limits and beyond the term of life of the style in which it was originally incorporated. From this considered verdict of mankind there is no appeal. ‘Securus iudicat orbis terrarum.’

But the ‘classical’ form, though it enjoys a long-period existence, is never immortal. It only survives as a true Classic until it is replaced by something more perfectly harmonizing with the technical and economic conditions of the world as modified by secular changes, and such is our ingrained respect for the past that forms once classical may sometimes linger on in a decrepit condition long after they have exhausted their living significance and value.

From a practical point of view it is essential to distinguish between the style and the 'classic' to which it has given birth. Failure to make this distinction has led to great confusion in the discussions which rage round the question of the use of so-called 'period' work. For example, while the study of past styles may be a perpetual source of fresh inspiration, it is generally agreed that any attempt under modern conditions to copy slavishly the details of a dead style, except for purely antiquarian reasons, is to be deprecated as violating the fundamental laws of art production. It does not, however, by any means follow that certain art-forms which have become 'classical' should not continue to be reproduced, even though they were originally associated with a style which has perished. For so long as these classical art-forms retain their own vitality they are part of the living tissue of national art-tradition.

CHAPTER VII

THE INTERACTION OF NATIONAL ART CULTURES

When two alien styles impinge on each other one of three things must happen. Either one of the styles conquers, destroys, and replaces the other, or they blend and give rise to a new style derived from both, or they remain mutually impervious. Which of these three results will follow depends on a number of factors, of which two of the most important are the relative 'strength' or artistic energy of the two cultures, and the degree of affinity between them.

It is of interest to illustrate these propositions by a few historical examples.

(1) My first example illustrates the influence of the factor of relative strength. It is drawn from very ancient history, or rather from prehistoric times, of which our main knowledge is derived from the survival of art products. These relics largely consist of pottery, which is at once among the most perishable of wares and the most indestructible of materials.

A striking illustration of each of the three results of the impact of alien styles, dependent mainly on relative strength, is afforded by the influence of Cretan ceramic art in the so-called 'Minoan' age on the art of pottery in the Cyclades, on the Greek mainland and in Egypt respectively, all being cultural areas sufficiently akin to make them capable of receiving and assimilating artistic influence from the others.

(*a*) When Cretan ceramic art spread to Melos (the centre of 'Cycladic' art culture) about 1600 B.C. the Minoan culture of Crete was at the very height of its energy and splendour. The native art which it encountered had, however, already reached a stage of stagnation and decay owing to its comparative isolation. 'Left to themselves, the Melians had not been able, owing to greater poverty and lack of opportunity, to keep up the impulse',[1] which at an earlier date had brought them ahead of Crete. The result was that native Melian art withered before the attack, and thenceforth all the pottery of Melos consisted either of ware imported from Crete or of local imitations thereof. Here was a case of destruction of a weaker by a stronger style without any permeation or blending.

(*b*) The result of the influence of Cretan ceramic art on the mainland of Greece was very different. Here it encountered two distinct styles, both originally derived from foreign sources, viz. a native style of ‘matt’ painted vases derived from Melos, and the so-called ‘Minyan’ ware believed to be due to Asiatic influence and closely resembling the ceramic art of Troy. For a long period the three styles persisted side by side, and the local variant of Melian ware is found together with imported Cretan pottery and local imitations thereof in the shaft graves of Mycenae.

---

[1] Hall, *Aegean Archaeology*, p. 84.

Ultimately the stronger Cretan art prevailed, but not without assimilating features from the Minyan ware (e.g. the characteristic ‘Kantharos’ form with upstanding handles). Thus a true blend of styles emerged, and when the artistic hegemony of Crete was ended by the destruction of Knossos about 1400 B.C., the mainland modification of Cretan art became the dominant style and was reintroduced into Crete from Mycenae, when the site of Knossos became gradually reoccupied.

But the great traditions of Cretan art which had originally imposed itself on the mainland, though greatly weakened and decadent, were not quite dead, and were strong enough to recombine with the imported Mycenaean variant to produce a second blend though of a de-generate type. As Mr. Hall says, 'The true L.M. III ware of Crete differs somewhat from the true Mycenaean wares. And Cretan civilization, though fallen from its high estate, still preserves something of its national character.'[1]

Here we have an example of the blending of styles, the stronger style gradually acquiring an ascendancy, but assimilating some features of the weaker style in the process.

(*c*) Cretan pottery penetrated in large quantities to Egypt, as is shown by the abundant remains found there contemporaneous with the twelfth and eighteenth Egyptian Dynasties (say about 1800 and 1400 B.C. respectively).

But there seems to have been no real intermingling of styles. 'The culture of Egypt was far too old and too stable to be affected by any foreign civilization except superficially.'[2] And though some branches of Cretan art owed much to Egyptian influence, it is doubtful if Egyptian pottery had any important reaction on 'Minoan' ceramic art. In the early Egyptian room at the British Museum will be found some vases of characteristic Cretan form, but it is questionable if they were produced in

---

[1] Hall, *Aegean Archaeology*, p. 163 (L.M. III means the third or last subdivision of the late Minoan period, say from 1400–1200 B.C.).

[2] Hall, *Aegean Archaeology*, p. 22.

Egypt. It seems more likely that they were Cretan products introduced by way of trade. Here, then, we have an example of the third effect, when the two art cultures which come into contact are mutually impervious.

(2) My second historical example illustrates the importance of affinity in determining the result of contact between two National art cultures.

The importance of the factor of affinity will be evident when we consider on the one hand what a large part is played by purely utilitarian considerations in the evolution of styles of art, and on the other hand what a potent influence is exercised by religious and social sympathies and antagonisms in promoting the assimilation or rejection of artistic forms of expression. It follows that peoples with close cultural affinities and hence strongly resembling each other in general modes of life, thought, and religious beliefs, are much more likely to be mutually sensitive and receptive to artistic styles than peoples whose forms of culture are more widely separated.

A good example of the influence of ‘affinity’ or of its absence on the interpenetration of styles is afforded by the readiness with which Saracenic (Mohammedan) and European (Christian) forms of art and architecture combined in the Middle Ages to form permanent and fertile blends, as compared with the failure of Mohammedan architecture in India to form any stable and lasting combination with Hindu forms.

Not only were the forms of Christian architecture in Europe which led from Roman to Gothic profoundly affected by the East, but Gothic art itself, though essentially a Western development, is also deeply impregnated with oriental influence.

To quote Professor Lethaby :

> 'There is much more of the East in Gothic in its structure and fibre than is outwardly visible. . . . The causes which underlay this art are to be found in a long infiltration of the Oriental spirit to the point of saturation, and then the bursting out of new, yet old, energy shaped to Northern requirements.'[1]
>
> 'It is not generally realized in how large a degree the Persian, Egypto-Saracenic, and Moorish forms are members of one common art with Gothic and developed side by side with it.'[2]

Besides the continuous influence exerted by the slow infiltration above described we have the splendid example of the direct union of styles in Sicily in the twelfth century A.D.

> 'The diverse elements in the blood of this Art—Arabic, Greek, and Northern—soon produced a magnificent school :

---

[1] Lethaby, *Mediaeval Art*, p. 7.

[2] Ibid., p. 8.

bold, yet refined; simple, yet glittering and splendid. Its great monuments are the Cathedral of Cefalu (1132), the Palace Chapel of Palermo (consecrated 1140), the Abbey of Monreale (built from 1174–82) and the Maitorana, Palermo (1184–1221). In these buildings Damascus, Mount Athos, Rome, and Cluny, seem to make equal contributions to a dream story of Architecture.'[1]

Contrast this with the fate of the various attempts to effect a blend between Saracenic and Hindu architecture in India.

Contemporaneously with the union of Saracenic and European influences in the splendid Sicilian architecture just referred to, the early Mohammedan invaders of North-West India were directing the construction of Mosques and tombs through the instrumentality of Hindu builders and with the aid of pillars and other fragments taken from Hindu temples.

The composite result thus produced is perhaps seen at its highest in such buildings as the wonderful Kutb Mosque (about A.D. 1210) in old Delhi. 'Nowhere', says Fergusson, 'would it be possible to find Mahommedan largeness of conception combined with Hindu delicacy of ornamentation carried out to the same extent and in the same manner.'[2]

But the two styles were not really blended. The pointed arches characteristic of Mohammedan art were erected by Hindus, who did not understand arch construction, and who imitated the arch form by means of projecting flat horizontal slabs. They covered the faces of these arches with delicate carving copied from Hindu pillars and friezes. The resulting mixture of forms which characterized the so-called 'Pathan' style was merely a temporary and superficial combination, and not a true and fertile union. Although, as Fergusson observes, 'the Hindu masons had learned to fit their exquisite style of decoration to the forms of their foreign masters,'[1] the fundamental incompatibility of ideas underlying the two schools of art became more and more apparent as time went on, and the forces of antagonism and reaction which were evoked by the attempted synthesis ever grew stronger and stronger. By the time of Tuglak Shah who built New Delhi in 1321, 'the Moslems had worked themselves entirely free from Hindu influence,'[2] and there is not a trace of it in the severe and massive buildings of Tughlakabad.

---

[1] Lethaby, *Mediaeval Art*, p. 117.

[2] Fergusson, *Indian and Eastern Architecture*, p. 513.

Henceforth the two streams never mingled until the new impulse given by Akbar in the sixteenth century. Akbar was one of the greatest eclectics of history, and he employed his vast energy and influence to produce a fusion of art, as he also attempted a fusion of religions. The result is seen in Akbar's buildings, especially in Fatehpur Sikri, but it was only a splendid *tour de force* with no element of permanence. As Fergusson says:

---

[1] Fergusson, *Indian and Eastern Architecture*, p. 510.

[2] Ibid., p. 514.

> 'He seems to have had as sincere a love and admiration for his Hindu subjects as he had for those of his own faith, and, whether from policy or inclination, to have cherished their arts as much as he did those that belonged exclusively to his own people. The consequence is a mixture throughout all his works of two styles, often more picturesque than correct, which might in the course of another half-century have been blended into a completely new style if persevered in. The spirit of tolerance, however, died with him. There is no trace of Hinduism in the works of Jehangir or Shah Jehan, and Aurungzebe would have been horrified at the suggestion that arts of the infidels could influence anything he did.'[1]

Yet at this very time Mogul art was showing its sensitiveness and receptivity to influences from sources less alien to its genius. One of the leading characteristics of its style of decoration, the inlaying of marble with precious stones (*Pietro duro*), was due to the importation of Italian artists in the early seventeenth century. The Indians, to whom the Italians taught this craft, made it their own by adapting it to local traditions and conditions. The *motifs* of the decoration were not European, but 'the patterns which the architects of Akbar had been in the habit of carving in stone or of inlaying in marble. . . The materials only were changed and the patterns only so far as was necessary to adapt them to the smaller and more refined materials that were to be used.'

---

[1] Fergusson, *Indian and Eastern Architecture*, p. 574.

There is contemporary evidence for the view (which is accepted by Mr. Vincent Smith and others) that the principal architect or one of the principal architects of the Taj Mahal, the most beautiful of Mogul buildings, was himself a Venetian.[1]

A seeming contradiction to the above argument is afforded by the readiness with which, under the direction of Akbar, Hindu painters assimilated the teaching of the Persian artists who came in his train, thus giving rise to a true blended or derivative style of painting known as the 'Mogul Style' which has fully demonstrated its stability. But the contradiction is not real ; in fact, the history of the development of Mogul painting from its earliest origins affords an excellent illustration of the process of evolution of styles.

---

[1] Geronimo Veroneo. The authority is Father Maurique, who visited Agra in 1640 while the building was still in progress. See Vincent Smith, *History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*, pp. 417–18.

Painting was an ancient Hindu art, though early specimens are rare. In the North-West of India this art, like that of sculpture, came under strong Greek influence during the period following Alexander's invasion. This Indo-Hellenistic art was carried into Central Asia when Turkestan was colonized from North-West India. Here it developed into a Buddhist art of painting and sculpture which became deeply affected by Chinese technique.[1]

From Turkestan it passed through Khotan to China and thence through Korea[2] to Japan, originating the 'classical' Buddhist schools of Chinese and Japanese art. But it also spread westward to Persia, where it flourished side by side with the Persian 'Saracenic' school, and it was ultimately reintroduced into India in the train of the Mogul Court over a thousand years after the emigration of its prototype from India to Turkestan. Thus the 'Persian' art of painting, which blended with the native Hindu art in the time of the Moguls, was not Saracenic in origin, but in part at least Hindu.

---

[1] For this discovery we are indebted to the explorations of Sir Aurel Stein and others. See Vincent Smith, *History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*, p. 313.

[2] The transmission to Korea can be dated, as the principal agent was Wei-chi I-song, son of the Bajna of Khotan, who was one of the foreign artists in the service of the Chinese Emperor Yang-ti (A.D. 605–17). See Vincent Smith, loc. cit.

It would carry us beyond the limits of this inquiry to speculate as to the features common to Moslem and Christian cultures, but absent from that of the Hindu, which justify us in asserting that the degree of affinity between the two former is much greater than between either of them and Hinduism. No doubt the outstanding feature is their common monotheism as opposed to Hindu polytheism. But that this is not a complete and sufficient explanation of the impermeability of Hindu art culture to external influences is suggested by its failure to assimilate the Hellenistic (so-called Gandhara) art which prevailed in North-West India during the first four centuries of the Christian era. It is true that the Graeco-Roman forms of Gandhara Sculpture became gradually 'Indianized' by the Hindu carvers who carried out the work. But, as Mr. Vincent Smith remarks, 'the ultimate models of Gandhara sculptors having been the masterpieces of Attic and Ionic art alien in spirit to the art of India, were usually susceptible of modifications by Indian craftsmen only in the direction of degradation.'[1]

---

[1] Vincent Smith, *History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*, p. 127.

Gandhara sculpture showed that it possessed a real power of blending with Asiatic influence (e.g. Chinese and Persian) when it passed into Turkestan. But in India itself it was practically sterile, and later schools of Hindu sculpture seem to have owed little or nothing to it. Here there was no case of incompatibility between a monotheistic and polytheistic culture. It is more likely that the incapacity of Hindu culture to assimilate the Greek influence was connected with its growing rigidity which culminated in the caste system. But until we know more (if we ever do) as to ancient Hindu art before the dominance of caste it is unwise to dogmatize.

(3) The two factors of relative strength and cultural affinity operating either separately or in combination were probably the chief determinants of the spread and limits of Gothic art in the Middle Ages. For example, Professor Lethaby has observed that 'Gothic is an art developed where a Teutonic people had built its civilization upon the ruins of a Roman province. In the countries comparatively untouched by the Germanic invasions this art never found a home.'[1] Radiating from France it found highly congenial soil in Anglo-Norman England, but in Italy it met the still over-

---

[1] Lethaby, *Mediaeval Art*, p. 135.

powering tradition of Imperial Rome and could make little headway against it. Where it penetrated beyond the field of the foreign missionary propaganda of the Friars, Gothic in Italy, and especially in South Italy, became 'more like varieties of pointed Romanesque of a refined type than like the Gothic of the North '.[1] And the latent antagonism between classical and Gothic art was naturally strongest in Italy, where a patriotic reaction against the northern intruder was an important cause of the movement known as the Renaissance.

But relative strength and affinity are not the only factors which determine the degree of mutual receptivity of two art cultures and their power to effect a fertile union.

In speaking of Hindu culture we have already hinted at another factor, viz. the growing rigidity of the caste system. It will generally be found that an essential factor in the mutual reactions between two art cultures is the stage of development which each has reached, and the actual state of their health and vigour. Experience confirms what would *a priori* be probable, that in the case of art cultures as in that of living organisms, youth and health are favourable to a true or fertile blend. As an art culture grows old, it loses its early plasticity, and advancing age brings rigidity and increasing incapacity to respond to external stimulus. Many examples of this law could be given, but one is as good as many. We have already seen how nearly akin were Gothic and Saracenic art, both being originally derived from a common Byzantine root. Throughout their youth and in their prime these kindred art cultures rarely met, without (as in Sicily) producing some splendid blend. It happened that in the extreme old age of both these art cultures they met again in Spain, at the end of the fifteenth century, when after the expulsion of the Moors the 'Moriscos' carried out church buildings for their Spanish Masters. The result was the so-called 'Mudejar' style, which, however, was not a fertile blend but merely a mongrel composition of incompatible forms. As Professor Carl Justi observes—'it is not a true style or even a new modification of a style: it is simply an external application of somewhat incongruous elements to any kind of structure.'[1] Both of the decadent cultures which met had lost their power of assimilation.

---

[1] Lethaby, *Mediaeval Art*, p. 278; ibid., p. 6.

There are examples in history of art cultures so firmly established and governed by such rigid rules that it was impossible for any foreign ideas to obtain a lodgement, while at the same time the venerable and impermeable national art culture retained its power of permeating and influencing other weaker or more plastic cultures with which it came into contact. The outstanding example of such an art culture is that of ancient Egypt, which for many centuries remained almost entirely impervious to external art influences, without apparently losing its virility, or diminishing its power of influencing other art cultures such as those of Crete and Greece.

---

[1] 'Historical Sketch of Spanish Art,' by Professor Carl Justi. (Prefixed to Baedeker's *Handbook to Spain*, p. xlvi.)

No doubt in the early beginnings Egypt borrowed freely from other art cultures, but from the time of the fourth dynasty up to the fall of the new Empire, that is to say over a space of 2,500 years, the native art tradition persisted without apparently taking any permanent impression from the foreign influences which successively came into contact with Egyptian life. And this was in spite of long periods of anarchy and foreign domination, and of one extraordinary but ultimately unsuccessful attempt by a native king to break the chain of tradition.

After all the work accomplished by Egyptologists the history of Egyptian art is still an enigma, and it is rash to generalize. But among the factors which contributed at once to its long preservation and to its want of receptivity, undoubtedly the most important was its complete subordination to utilitarian motives of a religious order, which practically forbade deviation from the rigid and detailed rules elaborated by the priesthood. 'The artist, obliged to think above all of the welfare of those (i.e. the dead) for whom he was working, was not free to abandon himself to his inspiration nor to diverge from the rules in which religion imprisoned him.'[1]

The rules as to position and attitude of statues were extraordinarily detailed and rigorous. In the bas-reliefs of the temples 'nothing was modified in the course of ages but the distribution of the pictures and the degree of skill of the execution'.[2] 'When by chance any were born whose inventive minds rebelled against the half-technical, half-religious education of the workshop their efforts towards progress or reform had no serious results. Might it not well be that by changing something in the recognized processes they would compromise the salvation of their models?'[3]

Under such conditions all variations either 'continuous' or 'discontinuous' were doomed to elimination by an inexorable law of 'natural

[1] Maspero, *Art in Egypt*, p. 17.

[2] Ibid., p. 18.

[3] Ibid., p. 300.

selection ', which considered only the welfare of the dead. If no real development of style could take place under these conditions, still less was there room for the assimilation of foreign styles. Egyptian kings might receive presents of Babylonian couches or tissues, or Cretan metal and earthenware, but the native traditional style governed by minute rules could not react to their influence.

But the domination of rules which forbade development also acted as a preservative, just as hereditary caste has done in India. It would seem as though the soul of Egyptian art were mummified and preserved from decay like the bodies of Egyptian kings.

We have now considered some of the principal conditions which determine the results of the interaction of two art cultures which come into contact. The conditions so far examined have been those affecting the character of the art cultures themselves, their age and stage of development, their health and vigour, their relative energy, and the degree of their affinity. But it is clear that the results of intercourse must also depend largely on conditions affecting the channels of communication between the two cultures and the modes in which they come into contact.

For example, interpenetration may be effected by the actual circulation of art products, or by the migration of artists by whom they are produced, or by the diffusion of knowledge and ideas, whether by travel or by such methods as written or pictorial description.

It is evident that these different methods of contact may by no means lead to identical results in the way of blends, and it is further evident that the actual and relative importance of the different methods has greatly varied in different countries and periods. For example, the modern growth of means of mechanical reproduction by photography and kindred methods has immensely stimulated the diffusion of knowledge of different art cultures without any actual transference either of artists or of their products, while at the same time the great growth of international trade has made consumers in all parts of the world familiar with the actual products of the industrial art of distant countries to a degree never known before.

If we look at the question historically there is at the outset an important distinction to be drawn. While in respect of portable works of art dissemination and contact of styles can be effected by any or all of the channels mentioned above, fixed buildings and monuments cannot be transported, and styles of architecture can therefore only spread and influence each other through migration of artists or through the spread of information. As the evolution and interaction of architectural styles carry with them corresponding developments of a number of ancillary arts, any general estimate of the factors in the 'crossing' or 'blending' of styles of art must give a foremost place to the migration of workers, and the spread of information by means other than the actual import or export of goods.

Travelling artists have in all times played a great part in the blending of styles. The Byzantine Emperor sent artists to Cordova to decorate the great Mosque with mosaics and plastic ornament, and from this beginning sprang the first definitely Arab or Saracenic style of decoration. French Gothic was acclimatized in England by French master-masons such as William of Sens. The mosaic decoration of Edward the Confessor's shrine in Westminster Abbey was the work of Peter Civis Romanus, who at Henry III's invitation brought from Rome the art of 'Cosmati' work, for which at an earlier date Rome had been indebted to the Byzantine art of 'parcel-mosaic'. So, as we have already seen, Austin of Bordeaux and his Italian colleagues taught the Indian craftsmen the art of *pietro duro*, which in their hands became the most characteristic feature of Mogul decoration.

The mutual reactions of Chinese and Japanese art were largely influenced by the penetration of Japanese artists and craftsmen into China and of Chinese or Korean artists and craftsmen into Japan. For example, in the fifteenth century the Japanese painter Sesshu became court painter to the Emperor of China.[1] Early in the next century a Japanese (Gorodayu Shonsui) travelled to China to learn the secrets of porcelain manufacture and painting.[2] From time to time colonies of Korean potters were imported by Japanese princes to introduce this art into Japan.[3] In 1710 the governing 'Shogun' invited a Chinese painter (Namping) to reside at Nagasaki, where his school met with great success.[4] The impression one derives from the history of the art relations between Japan and China is that, whether the individual migrants were Chinese or Japanese, the 'initiative' generally (though not invariably) came from Japan, whose art culture was at once more plastic, receptive, and imitative than the older culture of China and Korea. Those who think of Japan as having lived an isolated and self-contained artistic life until its recent opening to western influences fail to appreciate the extent of the artistic intercourse which for many centuries existed between Japan, China, and Korea.

---

[1] Blacker, *The A B C of Japanese Art*, p. 51.

[2] Ibid., p. 256.

[3] Ibid., pp. 268 and 313.

[4] Ibid., p. 69.

There is another reason why, on the whole, the mutual intercourse of architectural styles has tended to 'breed true', i.e. to result in real blends which themselves have proved fertile in fresh developments. It is not only that the influence of the alien style has been brought to bear on current native art by the intermediary of imported artists and workers, who understood the foreign methods, ideas, and technique, and could teach them to native workers, but expression had necessarily to be given to the foreign ideas in the 'atmosphere' of the native art culture, and frequently through the medium of craftsmen bred in the native traditions. Here we have favourable conditions for fruitful blending at their maximum—always granting that the essential conditions of such blending, e.g. vitality, affinity, &c., are present in the cultures themselves.

Where on the other hand (as in the case of the actual export and import of portable works of art) the foreign influence is brought to bear merely by the direct example of a complete work of art made abroad in an alien atmosphere, the conditions for a fruitful blend are not quite so favourable, inasmuch as any adaptation to native conditions of technique or materials or the conciliation of the foreign 'style' with native traditions, ideas, and tastes will be performed by native artists and craftsmen unassisted by foreign masters. In these circumstances there is a danger lest the foreign style be merely copied or travestied, without the formation of any true blend.

Nevertheless, the actual diffusion of wares has always played a very important part in the blending of styles of art. The transformation of the mathematical decoration of the so-called 'Geometric' pottery of the Achaeans into the archaic Greek style of the seventh century B.C., from which grew the magnificent development of Greek vase painting, was the direct result of contact with oriental wares reaching Greece from Egypt, Assyria, and Babylonia, and other parts of the near and middle East by way of trade, partly direct, partly via Rhodes and the other islands. Nor have we here to do with the direct influence of one style of pottery on another. The Greek ceramic artist drank influences from the whole range of the oriental arts brought before his eyes by foreign intercourse.

'Greek pottery was much too highly and richly developed, too firmly rooted to find it necessary to imitate oriental clay vases. The stimuli were of a much more general nature; they are chiefly visible in the ornamentation and pictorial types, they are taken from metal vases and richly embroidered materials, from costly carpets, articles of jewellery, engraved gems and other fine things which the foreign trader or the seafaring Greek brought from the near or far East or saw with his own eyes abroad.'[1]

The influence on vase decoration of textile and metal *motifs* was very clear and plain.

We have here an altogether exceptional conjunction of favourable influences; an outpouring of the accumulated wealth of oriental fancy, tradition, and achievement into the midst of the most receptive, adaptable, and daring race of free experimenters whom the world has ever produced—a race, moreover, exceptionally gifted with qualities of reason and serenity which effectually restrained all extravagance. The result was an evolution culminating in the age of Pheidias.

To take another example: the diffusion of small works of art—ivories, manuscripts, jewellery, textiles, &c. from Byzantium played a part almost equal in importance with the actual migration of Byzantine artists in the action of East on West which produced first Romanesque art and then Gothic. 'The West of course contributed the ability and readiness to absorb and transform these influences.'[1]

---

[1] Buschor, *Greek Vase Painting* (tr. Richards), pp. 29 and 30.

Commerce is of course not the only channel through which the diffusion of art wares may be brought about; there are the travels of tourists and 'connoisseurs' who bring home treasures and curiosities, or the presents or tribute from one state or ruler to another, e. g. the presents of Minoan vessels of gold, silver, and bronze carried to the court of Egypt by the Cretan Ambassadors ('Princes of Keftiu and the Isles in the midst of the sea'); or (to take a case of increasing importance in the modern world) foreign works of art may be consciously collected and classified in museums with the express object of educating and guiding the native artist and craftsman.

With the exception of this last-mentioned method, which needs further examination in connexion with the general question of art training, we need not linger to explore the results of any method of international distribution of art wares except that of commerce, which even in ancient times, and still more under modern conditions, has been immeasurably the most potent means of diffusing the movable products of different art cultures throughout the world.

---

[1] Lethaby, *Mediaeval Art*, p. 72.

In the illustrations which have already been given of blends of style effected through commercial intercourse, the essential processes of assimilation and adaptation of the product of alien art to the cultural conditions of the country of consumption have been effected in that country, and not in the country of export. The energy of new ideas or technique came from the country where the products originated, but the energy of adaptation and transformation was supplied by the country of import, and the evolution of the new or derived style which arose from the combination of these two energies took place in that country. This was necessarily the case where the product (e.g. a building) was fixed to the soil, but it was also the normal case in the past even as regards portable works of art, wherever commercial intercourse gave rise to a true blending of styles and not to a mere swamping of one by another.

Of course, it is not suggested that in past times exporters of works of art never gave consideration to the special conditions and tastes of the market for which the works were destined. For example, Xenophantos the Athenian vase painter of the fourth century B.C. endeavoured to please his eastern customers by decorating the vases intended for their market with figures of hunting Persians.[1] But no Graeco-Persian style of vase painting was evolved from such devices.

It is quite a modern development that the adaptation of products of one country to suit the technical and cultural conditions and tastes of another country should be systematically attempted in the country of export. This practice has arisen since and directly in consequence of the Industrial Revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries which led to the production of tissues and other wares formerly made chiefly by hand, by the aid of powerful and expensive machinery requiring large capital expenditure and skill for its manufacture, and necessitating large-scale 'mass' production in order to obtain an economic return.

Thus in place of the old-time export of small and varied consignments of a more or less experimental character which lent themselves to use as models for local or native imitation or adaptation, it was considered economically imperative to export large quantities of identical goods in a condition to be placed at once and without adaptation on the markets for which they were intended. And, generally speaking, the markets most open to the absorption of large quantities of low-priced goods were what are known commercially as 'undeveloped' countries, that is, countries not possessing resources of accumulated capital or trained labour enabling them to enter into effective competition on the same plane with the 'mass' goods derived from the more industrialized countries.

---

[1] Buschor, *Greek Vase Painting* (tr. Richards), p. 158.

In these circumstances, the only part that the native traditional arts and crafts of the country of import have been in a position to play has been to supply models and patterns for imitation or adaptation by the machine industries of the exporting countries. The intensive study of market requirements and peculiarities, which is one of the most powerful instruments of modern commercial competition, has included the minute study of the products of local traditional art and craftsmanship, and this study has been carried on by the same methods which are applied to other branches of commercial intelligence. The agents and correspondents of the great exporting houses in Great Britain, or the highly organized merchant houses which are established in the countries of importation, with connexions and allies in the exporting countries of Western Europe, have made it their practice to collect and send home samples and patterns of native wares that met the public taste, to serve as *motifs* for European designers and manufacturers. In this way (to take a single example) the hand block printed cotton fabrics of India became the starting-point of a new derivative series of designs for cotton prints carried out by the machine industry of Lancashire and exported to the market from which the original *motifs* were derived.

The result of such irresistible competition has been the gradual extermination of such native crafts as could be imitated by the aid of machinery. In spite of all attempts to revive or maintain the Indian industry of hand-printed cottons it is dying out, through the sheer wearing out of the blocks which craftsmen cannot be found to renew. This is only one out of a hundred examples of the destructive effect of the contact of West and East established through commercial methods which have taken insufficient account of the fundamental conditions under which alone a fertile blend of styles can be evolved. The melancholy story, so far as India is concerned, was told at length by Sir George Birdwood in his *Industrial Arts of India*. Meanwhile, in the exporting countries of Western Europe the intensive study of overseas markets and art cultures has led to the establishment of a number of special 'lines' of goods for export, carefully adapted in form, colour, and pattern to suit the various 'native' tastes. At their best some of these products may attain considerable beauty, and in some cases the products resulting from these methods have successfully made a market for themselves by their intrinsic art-value within the countries of Western Europe themselves. An example of such a result is the very attractive series of tissues based on West African *motifs* which have been recently exhibited by the British Institute of Industrial Art. But this is rather an accidental by-product than the normal outcome and purpose of the system described, which is primarily designed for the capture not of the European market but of the overseas markets from which the original *motifs* were derived.

Looked at broadly it must be confessed that the conscious imitation in an exporting country of a 'native' style of art with a view to capturing an overseas market, is inherently incapable of giving rise to a true and fertile blend of styles. The result is a mere mongrel combination, which cannot be the starting-point of any organic development, because from the nature of the case there can be no reaction from the consumer. As a matter of fact, when the object of the initial adaptation has been attained, and the competition of the native craft destroyed, the dominant tendency is not to attempt any further development on the same lines, but rather to revert to European *motifs*. The cotton prints now sent from Lancashire to India and other Asiatic and African markets are to an increasing degree based on purely European *motifs*. Perhaps, looking at the matter from the point of view of healthy development of styles, this reversion is not to be deplored, as there is (theoretically at least) a possibility of a true reaction being set up between the tastes of the eastern consumer and the ideas of the European producer, resulting in a real selective process, which might conceivably give rise to a fertile blend.

Whether such a result could in practice be attained under modern commercial conditions is more doubtful. It depends on many factors, including the degree of perfection of the means of ascertaining and transmitting the tastes and preferences of the native consumer, and the delicacy of appreciation or 'sensitiveness' of the European export houses with regard to the real significance of the intelligence thus received. In this connexion the observations in Chapter IV on the functions and education of the middleman should be borne in mind.

A somewhat different problem is raised by the practice which exists, though it is probably exceptional, of employing native designers in an oriental country such as China to supply *motifs* to be adapted by European designers for the production of figured tissues for export to the East. This method has at least the advantage that the Chinese 'designer' can within limits react to local influences in the country of consumption.

But the whole subject of design for export, especially to distant countries in widely different cultural areas, needs thorough and systematic research, especially from the point of view of stimulating the healthy interaction and development of styles, and of avoiding or mitigating those injurious results of penetration, which have been so conspicuous in the earlier stages of intercourse between the great machine industry of the West and less developed countries overseas.

CHAPTER VIII

PERIODIC MOVEMENTS OF ART ENERGY

So far we have spoken mainly of 'common art'—the current popular art of a country, 'racy of the soil' in which it grows, the faithful reflection of the national culture and the repository of the national traditions. It is this 'common art' which, as I emphasized in my first chapter, is the principal object of our study. We have referred but slightly, and mainly for purposes of illustration, to those splendid outbursts of art energy which occur from time to time, and which produce what is rightly called 'great' or 'fine art'. The higher manifestations of these epochs of great art are quite beyond economic analysis, but nevertheless there is something which needs to be said about them, in order to set them in their proper relation to the continuing substratum of common art, out of which they emerge and into which when exhausted they relapse.

Something, I say, needs to be said on this subject, if only because of the perpetual craving felt, during a time of artistic anarchy like the present, for some means of producing fine art without the necessary preparation and discipline of an intermediate stage of common art. There are few matters on which we can lay down definite laws in relation to outbursts of artistic energy, but the law which we can infer from observation with the least element of doubt is that an essential condition of such an outburst is the pre-existence of a continuous and strong tradition of common art. Such traditional common art supplies the conservative element in the movement—the thread of continuity which runs through it, the fibres which attach it to the soil of the country in which it flowers. The element of variation, innovation, and energetic experiment is supplied by the exceptional combination of forces which give rise to the upheaval, but these forces must have resisting material on which to work, and this material can be nothing but the groundwork of traditional common art.

It has already been observed that periods of great or fine art do not show a tendency to recur regularly in the same country, or to follow any recognizable law of periodicity. In this respect they differ widely from such economic wave movements as cycles of business activity, credit, prices, or employment. Notwithstanding this difference, however, the movements of artistic energy which culminate in great art epochs present certain analogies with the movements of economic energy which produce alternate waves of good and bad trade, and it is worth inquiring how far the results of recent research into the latter phenomena throw light on the more obscure phenomena of variations in artistic energy.

The analysis of economic cycles has for some time attracted much attention in connexion with problems of unemployment and monetary policy, and a great deal of ingenuity and labour has been expended on the attempt to identify the original cause which sets the wave in motion. There have been rival schools of thought, one claiming that the ultimate cause is psychological, another that it is economic, a third that it is cosmical. I am disposed, however, to think that an exaggerated importance has been sometimes attributed to the search for the true originating cause of a disturbance of equilibrium, and that a more crucial question to be answered is the nature, direction, and intensity of the reactions, both immediate and remote, which are set up by such a disturbance, however originated. It is, in fact, becoming recognized that the first divergence from the normal may be due to any of a number of causes acting either singly or in combination. The really important question is to determine how far the resulting reactions will tend, either immediately or within a measurable time, to check and counteract divergence, or how far they will act cumulatively so as to widen it. In other words, how far is the position which is disturbed one of stable or of unstable equilibrium.

There is no need here to analyse the purely economic monetary or physical factors in this wave motion, since at present we have no certain knowledge of anything quite analogous to them in the movements of artistic energy.[1] It is different with the psychological factor, i.e. the ebb and flow of confidence and distrust. These qualities are infectious, and consequently act cumulatively over a short period. That is to say, confidence breeds confidence, and distrust breeds distrust. On the other hand, each of these qualities when sufficiently exaggerated tends to evoke the opposite quality. At some point, therefore, confidence becomes over-confidence, then foolhardiness, and then gives place, either gradually or suddenly, to distrust. Once the change has taken place it proceeds in its turn with ever-increasing swiftness. The net result is that a sufficiently great disturbance of credit equilibrium, however caused, tends to set up a wave motion or cyclical fluctuation, the wave length being measured by the time necessary to generate the forces by which the movement is eventually checked and reversed.

---

[1] Reference, however, should be made to a remarkable little book by Sir W. Flinders Petrie entitled *Revolutions of Civilisation*, to which my attention was only called after this chapter was in print. The author arrives at far more definite conclusions as to the causes and periods of art movements than I had thought possible on existing data. He finds evidence for a fairly constant wave period of about 1,500 years, and even suggests the possibility of a physical basis, e.g. climatic changes leading through famines to mass migrations and hence to new racial blends, resulting in new art impulses. Whatever view be taken of the adequacy of the evidence to support these daring conclusions, the book is in the highest degree suggestive and stimulating.

Now, turning to movements of art energy, we have already seen, when dealing with the evolution of styles, that the normal flow of art production is constantly liable to disturbance by a great number of influences, some external, some internal, some 'continuous', some 'discontinuous', some depending on supply, some on demand, some comparatively trivial and casual, some profound and secular. The causes of such variations range from the conscious act or even the caprice of individual artists to such epoch-making events as the discovery of new processes, implements, or materials, or a new contact between two alien art cultures, or even the rise of a new intellectual or religious movement. The majority of these disturbances occasion but a momentary surface ripple, and are promptly checked and brought to rest by the operation of the selective forces described in a previous chapter. Of those that survive the selective process the vast majority produce only limited and local results, e.g. they contribute to the evolution or transformation of some national style of art work. But in rare cases, where a very exceptional combination of favourable conditions is present, the variation may evoke psychological reactions analogous to but even more intense than those resulting from a disturbance of economic equilibrium.

A new revelation of beauty, a fresh form of creative art expression, is capable of generating enthusiasm, which is, as it were, confidence raised to a white heat, and correspondingly more infectious. When Professor Lethaby, in speaking of the great period of Gothic art, says ‘ the folk fell in love with building ’, he uses no extravagant metaphor, but describes in accurate language what actually occurred in and about the thirteenth century in Western Europe.

The new modes of art expression fire the people's imagination, and from this point the movement progresses like a rolling snowball, with ever-increasing momentum, and with the driving power behind it of every form of emulation and encouragement and general enthusiasm, ever quickening its pace and intensifying its energy, until the final culmination when the crest of the wave is reached.

The point at which the movement will be arrested—at which the wave will either break suddenly or begin gradually to subside—will be determined by causes partly internal and partly external. The principal internal cause is naturally the gradual exhaustion of the original impulse by the working out of its consequences up to the limits of technical and economic possibility or fitness. Further advance becomes either impossible, or only possible at a progressively slower pace and against continually increasing resistance. The creation of art-values has, in fact, reached the stage of 'diminishing returns'.

Of course, the stage of exhaustion and arrested movement is not reached simultaneously over all the range of modes of expression through which the art inspiration is interpreted. The point of exhaustion at which the movement slows down and finally comes to rest will depend largely in each case on the technical and economic conditions of the particular craft. Thus we should naturally expect that there will not be any single moment at which it can be said that the movement as a whole is exhausted. One craft (e. g. painting) may continue to progress after a decline has set in (say) in building, or vice versa, and each of the decorative arts will, within limits, have its own separate culminating point.

We have here a state of things closely analogous to what occurs in a credit cycle, where one of the most powerful factors in bringing an upward movement to an end is the fact that some classes of business reach and pass the limit of their price-raising capacity before others. Professor Wesley Mitchell has lately pointed out that

> 'The rise of prices' (i.e. that which marks the upward movement of the cyclical wave) 'may be stopped by the consequences of its own inevitable inequalities. These inequalities become more glaring the higher the general level is forced; after a time they threaten serious reduction of profits to certain business enterprises, and the troubles of these victims dissolve the confidence in the security of credits with which the whole towering structure of prosperity has been cemented.'[1]

The analogues in the art world to these economic forces of dissolution are the growing forces of internal criticism, scepticism, and pessimism bred by the experience of those branches of art creation which are the earliest to find themselves brought to a standstill, either by increasing technical or economic difficulties, or by the exhaustion of the original impulse.

---

[1] 'The Stabilization of Business,' pp. 26–7. (*The Problem of controlling Business Cycles*, by Wesley C. Mitchell.)

As the movement becomes slower and feebler the germs of distrust find an ever easier lodgement, and spread their infectious influence throughout the weakened organism.

Sometimes the end comes suddenly—the wave breaks, as when Gothic art came to a definite end in the sixteenth century, partly through exhaustion of technical possibilities, partly through the interference of the fresh wave of energy known as the Renaissance. Sometimes, as in Greek art, there was no definite break, but a long autumnal period of gradual decadence.

Historically, external events have frequently played a conspicuous part in ending as in inaugurating a great art epoch, but this influence has seldom been decisive unless the movement has been already collapsing from internal decay.

The destruction of Knossos about 1400 B.C. marked, rather than caused, the collapse of Minoan art, which was already rapidly degenerating. The check to Arabic and other oriental culture and art by the devastating Mongol conquests, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, is an outstanding, but happily very exceptional, event in human history.

Catastrophic events of this order, though of course they are traceable, like all other events, to definite trains of historical causes, are practically fortuitous so far as concerns the influence on any particular centre of art culture. On the other hand, the internal forces which tend to weaken, arrest, and finally to destroy a great art movement, are not less inevitable and automatic in their action than the economic reactions which determine the wave motion of credit cycles. A far longer time, however, is required for their development, and the length of the period necessary for their full operation varies within much wider limits, if, indeed, any definite limits can be set on it at all. In the present state of our knowledge, it is impossible to forecast the period of a wave of artistic energy, and if we incline to the belief that such wave movements are really recurrent and continuous, it is rather because our analysis shows that the elements necessary for such cyclical movements are present, than because in actual history we can clearly trace their existence and sequence.[1] The great length of period required to complete a cycle, and the profound changes in the local distribution and admixture of population and other cultural conditions which may take place during the interval would be sufficient to account for the rarity with which the upward wave movement makes itself felt twice in succession at the same point of the earth's surface. We want, however, a great deal more organized research before we can dogmatize about cycles of artistic energy. We need to reconstruct, so far as possible, the 'natural history' of certain epochs of great art; to trace their early origins, the sequence of developments which led up to the final efflorescence, and the working of the internal and external forces which contributed to the arrest and decay of the impulse in each of the main branches of art production separately. We have to establish the order of time in which the movement was brought to a standstill in each of these branches. Above all, we need to correlate the movements of art energy with those of other movements of human thought, emotions, and actions, as shown in intellectual, religious, and national life.

---

[1] But see foot-note to p. 204.

When all this study has been completed, we shall perhaps be able to formulate definite laws of cycles of art energy, and it is more than likely that the tentative and fragmentary conclusions at which we have now arrived on the basis of imperfect and superficial inquiry will then need to be revised. If, as I hope, further systematic research is undertaken into the economic conditions of art production, one of the earliest lines of research which I should recommend would be the comparative study of the causation, history, and decline of a few of the great art movements of the world.

There is no need to attempt an exhaustive list of such movements. For example, such a list as the following would give an ample range of choice for the researcher :

(1) The Aegean art of the Minoan Age, culminating about 2000 B.C., in Crete.
(2) The Egyptian art of the Old Empire, culminating in Lower Egypt in the time of the Fourth Dynasty.
(3) The Greek Art of the so-called 'Classical' Age, culminating at Athens in the fifth century B. C.
(4) Gothic art, culminating in France in the thirteenth century A. D.
(5) The art of the Renaissance, culminating in Western Europe in the sixteenth century A. D.
(6) Mogul art, culminating at Agra and Delhi in the seventeenth century A. D.

The subject has a certain practical importance, because it is highly probable that with the development and improvement of all modes of intercommunication, the effects of any similar movement in the future will tend more and more to be world-wide, instead of isolated and local. Thus we may reasonably expect that the next great upheaval of artistic energy will more or less synchronize throughout the civilized world. Whether any one now living will see such a movement it is quite impossible to predict. Certainly during past history the periods of 'high-power' art, though of course long in comparison with a mere credit cycle, have been very short in relation to the long intermediate intervals of low-power artistic energy. Whether in some future stage of human progress the discrepancy between the length of these periods will be materially altered is a matter for speculation.

What we are practically concerned with here and now is to know how far the advent of a great art epoch can be hastened or retarded by conscious human effort. So far as we can answer this question at present there is one and only one way in which we can consciously prepare the ground for a future great art movement, viz. first to restore and afterwards to preserve in unimpaired vigour a living traditional common art, and at the same time to maintain our social and economic system in a state of health which will permit of continuous reactions between art culture and environment. Out of the countless variations resulting from these reactions it may be that one day some one will be the starting-point of a great art epoch. That lies on the knees of the gods. In the meantime we must be content to do well what we can do—work, deficient perhaps in inspiration, but at all events sound, useful, conforming to technical and economic conditions, perfectly fulfilling its functions, and, if lacking the highest form of expressive beauty, still comely and lovely to the eye. All this is within our power if we choose to follow intelligent guidance and to make the necessary effort. What is not within our power is what we too often prefer to attempt—to make a short cut to fine art by directly imitating the work created in past periods of spiritual insight. It seems so much more attractive, so much more repaying, to try to learn to paint like Raphael, or to build like the great Gothic masters, than to follow patiently the long and narrow road which alone can lead either us or our successors to the desired goal.

CHAPTER IX

EPILOGUE

THROUGHOUT much of the preceding discussion there runs a *petitio principii*, an assumption for which no proof has been offered that art, or more properly speaking the production of works of art, is at once desired and desirable.

The abstract economist bases his pyramid of economic theory on the assumption that all men desire wealth, and though from the time of Cliffe Leslie the universality of the truth of that formula has occasionally been subjected to critical attack, the general verdict seems to be that it is true over such a wide area, and with comparatively so few exceptions, as to afford a sound basis on which to erect a working theory of men's actions.

Can we similarly say that there is a general and ‘effective’ demand for art?

Clearly some of the elements of art-value are objects of human desire nearly as widespread as the desire for wealth itself. That an article should be useful, and that it should be perfectly fit for its function, are conditions which, when clearly explained, must appeal to the healthy and enlightened judgement of all. The appeal of other elements, such as unity and beauty, is probably less general, and no doubt even persons belonging to the same cultural area differ very widely in the degree of their sensitiveness to these qualities.

Of course, in a sense, the statement that every one desires beauty is a mere truism, if we accept the view that beauty, regarded from the angle of demand, is the quality which excites our desire through the appeal to the eye. But the doctrine of the relativity of beauty does not mean that all estimates of beauty are matters of individual caprice or prejudice, without reference to any common or social standard. That common standard may vary widely in different ages and under different cultural conditions, but at any given time and place it is fairly stable—much more so than the likes or dislikes of any individual ; just as the consensus of enlightened judgement is more stable than the opinions of a single person. Were this not so there could be no economic theory of art-values nor without a corresponding assumption could there be any theory of value in exchange.

There is probably a large percentage of human beings who have a sufficient degree of preference for things deemed beautiful by current standards to express that preference in an economic form, i. e. to be willing, other things being equal, to pay somewhat more for a beautiful than for an ugly article, which will equally serve the immediate utilitarian purpose.

It is, however, equally true that under present conditions the degree of preference for works of art exhibited by a large section of the consuming public in this country is insufficient, when translated into economic terms, to elicit and maintain a constant and ample flow of art production. This is at bottom what is meant when we say that we lack a real living traditional art culture at the present time. We do not mean that there is no appreciation of art, or that meritorious and beautiful works of art are not being produced, but that the economic preference for works of art, as compared with other objects of human desire, is insufficient to support a large and steady output of such works.

Before we can usefully consider a practical policy there is a second question which presses for an answer. Are we sure that art is desirable, in the sense that it is an important and legitimate object of human endeavour to raise the level of production and of appreciation of works of art? If we could raise the standard of appreciation of art on the part of the public, and lessen or remove some of the technical and economic difficulties which since the Industrial Revolution have clogged and obstructed art work in this and other countries, are we certain that by so doing we should benefit the world ?

I think that there can be only one answer to this question, as there can be only one answer to the question whether it be desirable to raise the level of morality or to widen the bounds of knowledge. If we believe that beauty, as well as goodness and truth, is a worthy object of human desire and aspiration, it is not because we can prove the proposition by deductive reasoning, but because we are by nature so constituted as to be incapable of believing the opposite.

Assuming, then, that the raising of the standard of art production and appreciation is a worthy object of our efforts, what can we infer from our preceding discussions which will be helpful in the task ? Clearly any such inferences can only be tentative and provisional, and throughout this final summary I would rather speak of 'suggestions for further thought and study' than of definite 'conclusions', a term which seems to me too confident, not to say arrogant, to describe the more or less vague ideas which emerge from our brief and imperfect survey.

The incompleteness of the inquiry arises from many obvious causes. In the first place the work has only just begun and has so far been confined within narrow limits; the data have often been scanty or obscure; and the whole region we have tried to explore is as yet very imperfectly charted and surveyed.

But another reason is the self-imposed limitation that we should refrain from investigating such fundamental questions as the essential nature of the phenomena of art and beauty, whose material embodiments form the subject-matter of the discussion. The limitation was necessary; for without it we should have speedily lost ourselves in a maze of wordy dialectic, which could yield no clue to problems of practical interest, for the good and sufficient reason that the essential nature of beauty is not to be explained by verbal argument and logical analysis, but to be apprehended by quite different means and channels.

Nevertheless it is well to remember that in the presence of this unsolved mystery any analysis of economic conditions is bound to remain in some respects partial and superficial. Certain elements in art-value may lend themselves to quantitative measurement, but when we come to the element of beauty itself there can be no objective standard, and we can only rely on the considered verdict of competent opinion. That is no doubt as good a test as can be applied to many other branches of human knowledge. And yet we feel that there is here an elusive something which escapes us. Just as two articles of food may yield the same food-value according to ordinary chemical analysis, and yet produce different results in nourishing the human body, so two works of art indistinguishable by analytic tests may differ in their power of nourishing the human spirit. We seem to need some conception analogous to that of 'vitamines' to express this imponderable element which evades our analysis. Possibly it is in this region of 'imponderables' that the producer's factor of enjoyment and interest in work exercises its full influence, for all artists believe that this joy and interest are reflected in the product of labour. In fact we are conscious vaguely that beyond our merely quantitative measurements there lies a subtler qualitative distinction which can only be apprehended by other means, but which may ultimately make the whole difference between great and common art.

We may not pursue this tempting flight, but must come back to earth, and resume the more limited and humble task which lies immediately before us—which is concerned not so much with the fine and impalpable distinctions between great and common art as with the possibility of re-establishing a true living traditional art culture in our own country and in our own age.

What are the essential conditions for the maintenance of a living art culture?

It has long been a stock subject of debate whether art flourishes most under democratic, aristocratic, or autocratic institutions, and whether art production receives its greatest encouragement and opportunity in a state where wealth is evenly distributed or in one which presents great inequalities of riches. The general trend of our inquiry, however, leads us to doubt whether, in fact, the problem as usually put admits of a simple answer. Certainly if we look to past history we find little support for the view that a basic condition for the existence of a flourishing art culture is the presence of any particular form of political, social, or economic organization of society. We find art production flourishing or pining under every different kind of political and social institutions. No doubt diversities in the social and economic environment have a very powerful influence on the dominant type and quality of the national art culture, but no particular kind of environment appears to be a condition *sine qua non* for the existence and healthy functioning and development of a living art culture of some kind.

Our previous inquiry suggests that the essential or basic condition for a flourishing art culture is to be found not in any particular form or type of social organization, but in the maintenance of the healthy life of such organization irrespective of its form or type. By 'healthy life' I mean the definite quality of reacting freely, readily, and continuously to external or internal stimulus, and of thus causing and receiving modifications and adaptations which tend to establish and to maintain a harmony between the social organism and the source of the stimulus. The presence or absence of this quality of healthy life may coexist with the greatest diversity of forms of social or economic organization. Given such healthy life there must in normal circumstances grow up a national art culture of some kind. What the special kind of art culture will be and of what quality and tendencies, is a matter which will be determined by a hundred conditions, among which racial, economic, geographical, and political conditions will naturally have a prominent place.

Fashioned and moulded by all these conditions the art culture will propagate and perpetuate itself by tradition ; and between such tradition and the countless inventions and variations arising from the pressure of new needs and new ideas there will be a continuous struggle for existence, resulting in those developments, differentiations, and reintegrations which are the essence of a healthy and orderly art evolution.

Obviously the results of such a struggle between innovation and tradition will differ very widely according to the conservative or progressive characteristics of the race. A nimble-witted or volatile race, quick to change and instantly responsive to changing influences, will have an art culture very different from a race steeped in tradition and convention and overweighted with regard for its own past. The comparison of Greece with Egypt will naturally occur to the mind. So again the art demand of a country with widely diffused material prosperity on a moderate level will differ widely in character from that of a community where wealth is concentrated in the hands of a few rich individuals or ecclesiastical or secular corporations. Moreover, the character of traditional art production will tend to differ in a state with a large free and independent and socially powerful class of manual workers compared with one in which the mass of manual workers are servile or socially degraded and impotent.

It would be a fascinating subject for research to follow up this theme, and to illustrate from actual human history the effects of different political, social, and economic conditions on the type and trend of the corresponding national art culture. For the moment, however, I am mainly concerned to emphasize the point that this question, however important, only arises as a practical problem at a later stage, when the basic conditions for the continued and stable life of an art culture of some sort have already been assured.

As a matter of fact, these basic conditions are normally realized in most societies and in most ages. Taking a broad view, it is exceptional to find any country or race without a living traditional common art. Perhaps the only important exceptions are the periods immediately following some catastrophic social or economic change which has effectively broken the thread of traditional art and practice. There may then be an interval of artistic anarchy, until the broken threads are again joined up or new organic connexions are established. This transitory period of chaos may last for a good many years if the change has been very complete and widespread and especially if it has introduced a completely new economic and technical organization of production.

In such a transitional period the healthy reactions by which an art culture is normally kept in harmony with its social environment are temporarily impeded or completely interrupted, and new and vital relations have to be slowly evolved before they can be fully resumed. I repeat that this situation is exceptional and transitory if we take a broad view of human history, but it has a very special interest for us, because we ourselves are living in one of these exceptional periods of transition.

The great breach with tradition made by the mechanical discoveries and inventions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has by no means yet been made good. In this case the breach has been so complete and so general that many still find it difficult to believe that it is but temporary. Some believe that the Industrial Revolution has destroyed all possibility of a living art culture flourishing again in countries which have come under its baneful influence. Mass production, machine-made goods, subdivision of labour, distant and world-wide markets, cheapness of production and all the complexities of industrial organization, with which the present age is so familiar, are the characteristic marks of the Industrial Revolution, and each and all of them are regarded by many as the deadly foes of art production.

In the light of our inquiry we cannot deny that this view has a certain foundation, and the falsity of the picture as a whole is rather a falsity of perspective and proportion than of individual statement. It is difficult to detach ourselves sufficiently from our own environment to see the world problem in its true proportions, and to realize that the modern industrial revolution by which our art work is still overshadowed is not the only example, though perhaps the most striking example, of a catastrophic change of industrial methods, and that previous revolutions such as those arising from the prehistoric discovery of the use of metals, have also been followed by a momentary decline in existing art culture, only to be succeeded eventually by a fresh development.

But while the lessons of past history furnish a salutary corrective to pessimism we must not underrate the severity of the wound which the Industrial Revolution has inflicted on most branches of art culture in this country.

In speaking of the Industrial Revolution it must always be remembered that the group of changes which we call by that name did not affect all countries or all modes of art expression simultaneously or with equal force. England as the focus of most of the great mechanical inventions of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries felt the shock earliest and to the most intense degree, and its effect on our beautiful but comparatively slender native art traditions was much more violent and devastating than (say) in France where the art tradition was more powerful and firmly established, and the development of the great machine industry was later and more gradual and partial. Perhaps the comparative slightness of the blow inflicted on French artistic crafts explains why the recuperative processes—e.g. the development of art, technical and trade schools, and of the organized design studios—have started earlier and have proceeded further in France than in England. There are countries in the East, and even in Eastern Europe, where throughout the greater part of the nineteenth century the traditional arts were practically uninfluenced by the economic revolution which had convulsed the West. Japan only felt its influence in the latter half of the nineteenth century. On the other hand the main growth of the United States of America and our own Dominions took place after the Industrial Revolution, and their traditions of art production were therefore derived from the European tradition which the Colonists carried with them. For such indigenous cultures as those of the Red Indian or the Maori were too alien in character to give rise to a fertile blend.

If the Industrial Revolution operated differently in different countries, it also affected different branches of art production in very different modes and degrees. For example, the art of painting pictures was little affected, while that of weaving figured tissues was completely revolutionized, and the art of pottery became and still remains a blend between a great machine industry and a handicraft.

Looking, however, at the situation from our own particular standpoint we may say broadly that the advent of the great machine industry which opened up vast new possibilities of abundance and cheapness struck such a blow at our existing art methods and traditions that it is only now after the lapse of three or four generations that it is possible to have a reasonable belief that the blow was not mortal, and that if not we, at least a future generation may see a new synthesis yielding a living industrial art consonant with modern economic and technical conditions.

We are indeed far from having reached such a synthesis, and it is fairly certain that if a living traditional art is to be achieved, soon enough and powerful enough to penetrate and rejuvenate the existing culture of the Western

World, we must support and strengthen and expedite by conscious effort and co-operation the slow working of unconscious evolutionary forces. It is only by calling in and fully utilizing the aid of combined social and economic effort on the part of the community that we can hope to make progress within a reasonable time.

Hence the ultimate result of our analysis is to justify and encourage all forms of civic and national effort which are intelligently planned and directed towards promoting the closer correlation of art with education on the one hand and with industry on the other. For this task we need deeper thought, more systematic experiment, more daring initiative, more sustained and patient effort, less sectional criticism and greater catholicity of spirit.

What exactly should be the practical methods to be adopted for the purpose is a question which would carry us far beyond the limits of this book. It has been my object rather to lay bare the fundamental conditions of the problem than to offer any detailed prescription for its solution. The ramifications of the subject are so complex and far-reaching when once we enter on a detailed practical consideration of remedial measures, that it would require a series of systematic investigations to cover the ground. The particular situation of each group of industries would need special exploration by persons possessing a technical acquaintance with its conditions and problems. This is a tempting subject for organized research such as has been recently attempted in New York State. In the present book, however, all that can be attempted is to lay down certain broad principles for guidance.

(1) The central problem that has to be faced is that which has been described in earlier chapters, viz. the growing specialization of industry and the wide separation between designer and manufacturer and between manufacturer and consumer, which at once endanger the vital unity of the work produced, and enfeeble or arrest the mutual reactions among the different factors in production, distribution, and consumption. Hence the primary objective of remedial measures must be the strengthening of these weakened connexions.

(2) Co-ordinate in importance and simultaneous with the above measures, there must be measures directed towards raising simultaneously the level of taste and appreciation on the part of each and every section of the community, consumer, distributor, and producer alike. This is clearly a question mainly of education, and especially of secondary education, i. e. the training of those who are likely

to exercise the most powerful influence on the forming of a national standard of quality.

(3) In choosing the most appropriate practical steps to give effect to the above principles we should neglect no promising means of promoting the end in view, even if such means appear novel and without precedent from the practice obtaining in past periods of living art. For we are to remember that we are not laying down the best régime for a normal and healthy organism, but seeking the best means of restoring health to an organism weakened by disease.

It must not be imagined that the medical regimen prescribed by the doctor to ensure the speedy recovery of his patient will be necessarily suitable for his normal diet and rule of life when health is fully restored. From a practical point of view we are only concerned at present with the first step, and all sorts of methods may be necessary or expedient during convalescence which may or may not prove suitable as permanent features in our future system of art production.

Thus the elaborate apparatus of publicly supported schools, art colleges, technical institutions and museums ; the propaganda, research and exhibition work of pioneer organizations such as the British Institute of Industrial

Art or the German Werk-Bund; the fostering and preservative work of Associations like the Art Workers' Guild, the standardizing and selective work of authorities like the Fine Arts Commission of Washington or the analogous body which has lately been established in this country—all these are valuable and indeed may be essential for the accomplishment of the task immediately in view. But if and when convalescence is completed and there is once more a normal and vigorous art culture in Great Britain, we cannot at present say how much of our present constructive work will be built into the permanent structure, and how much will be discarded as temporary scaffolding that has served its purpose. Present tendencies have to work themselves out more fully before there can be the necessary materials for any confident forecast on these matters.

Another caution which is necessary is to beware of mistaking the immediate for the ultimate goal. What exactly do we mean by the re-establishment of a true art culture? We mean that there will be an established practice and tradition of making useful things, well fitted for their function, conforming to the conditions of their production, suited to the economic needs and conditions of Society, and also possessing the quality of beauty.

We mean that this general practice will be largely unconscious and automatic, and will no longer depend on organized propaganda or spasmodic 'revivalist' movements. It will on the other hand be highly sensitive and reponsive to the changing demands and conditions of the society within which and for the benefit of which the art culture will exist. This picture may seem Utopian—so far is it from anything of which our own generation has had experience. It is indeed a goal worthy of all our efforts; yet this goal is itself only a starting-point.

What is to be the characteristic type and tendency of this art culture when re-established? Is it to be a luxurious and sumptuous art, like that of ancient Egypt, or (say) France in the days of the Grand Monarque, supported by and responding to the demand of the State or wealthy individuals and corporations, or is it to be predominantly a democratic art ministering to the reasonable desires of a large community of persons of moderate wealth? We could frame a dozen such conundrums, but we cannot at present supply the answers, nor is it indeed likely that all branches of our art production will develop along similar lines or to the same degree. All that can be said is that when the basic conditions of healthy art life are firmly established, the form which each mode of art expression will take will be settled partly by permanent influences beyond human control, such as climatic and other physical conditions or deeply implanted racial characteristics, partly by the pressure of economic forces only partially controllable by conscious effort, partly by deliberate choice between forms and ideals of national life and activity, the nature of which we cannot predict, and for which we can only prepare ourselves to choose wisely when the time comes, by fostering and maintaining the general health of the social and political organism.

From the analysis of great art movements in the previous chapter no less than from our examination of the conditions of present-day art, we are led to the conclusion that our immediate task is to end the present anarchy by substituting not a bastard imitation of fine art, but a firm basic tradition of common art. This preliminary process will be difficult and gradual, and many disappointments must be expected. At the best there will be no sudden or spectacular change, but a gradual approach towards settled conditions, very difficult to measure, and probably very unequal as between different branches of art work. As disease yields to convalescence, and convalescence merges into normal healthy life, we may expect that there will be a good deal less talk about art, in proportion as the thing itself becomes more natural and less self-conscious. When a real organic connexion has been once more established between art and the other aspects and modes of expression of the national life, we may be sure that very many things will still remain to be accomplished, and many new problems will present themselves for solution. But we shall have acquired a firm base for further progress, and thenceforth we may have a reasonable faith that as we advance the way will open out before us. All these things will be added unto us.

INDEX

A.

Achaean Invasion, results on Ceramic Art, 147.
Adam Smith, on division of labour, 41 et seq.
Adaptation of means to ends, 20.
— of designs to technical conditions, 83.
Adapter, the workshop, 83.
Adjustment of designing to executive staff, 77.
Aegean Archaeology, 147.
Aesthetic Philosophy, 16.
Affinity between Art Cultures, 140, 169.
Akbar, 176.
Akhnaton, 154.
Alien Styles, contact of, 169.
American Report, 90, 92.
Appreciation, raising the level of, 230.
Arab culture, influence of Mongol conquests on, 209.
Archaic Greek Pottery, 191.
Architecture, reactions between design and execution, 55.
Aristotle and utilitarian art, 20, 35.
Art, fine and common, 20.
Art, Work of, elements of, 17.
Art, Work of, economic definition of, 25.
—, —, valuation of, 26.
—, —, division of labour as applied to, 44.
Art Culture, conditions for healthy growth, 221.
Art-value, measurement of, 27.
— —, not synonymous with exchange value, 27, 28.
— —, elasticity of, 34, 140.
— —, affected by cultural conditions, 138, 150.
— —, effect of isolation on, 145.
— —, fitness as a condition of, 35, 110.

B.

Babbage, 41, 42.
Babylonian Tissues, 22.
Bachelor of Commerce Degree, 6.
Basic conditions of living Art Cultures, 221.
— —, fulfilled in normal societies, 224.
— —, liable to interruption by catastrophic changes, 224.
Bateson, 154.
Beauty, in works of art, 22.

Beauty, relation to love, 23.
—, local and general elements, 32, 33.
—, not homogeneous, 33.
—, relativity of, 34.
—, decorative and expressive factors, 33.
Biological Analogies, 23, 37, 146, 149, 159.
Birdwood, Sir George—'The Industrial Arts of India,' 197.
Blacker—'The A B C of Japanese Art,' 189.
British Institute of Industrial Art, 5, 198, 231.
Buddhist Classical Art, 179.
Buschor, Greek Vase Painting, 192, 195.
Byzantine Emperor and the Cordova Mosque, 188.
— works of Art dispersed, 192.

C.

Calculus of Pleasure and Pain, 18.
Capital, meaning of, 27.
Caste, 181, 182, 186.
Catastrophes, influence on Art Movements, 210.
—,— on Art Traditions, 224.
Changes, continuous and discontinuous, 154.
Chinese Art, relation to Japanese, 189.
Civilization, Revolutions of (Flinders Petrie), 204.
Classic, meaning of, 167.
—, survives parent style, 167.
Classical political economy, 13.
Climatic conditions for manufacture and design, 89.
Commerce, the main channel for diffusing art wares, 191.
Commercial Competition, effects on relation between Western and Eastern Cultures, 196.
Common Art, 20, 35, 37, 201, 213.
— —, tradition of, in normal societies, 224.
Composite Work of Art, 47.
Conditions, discipline of essential, 51.
Congruity, Law of, 21, 116.
Connoisseurs, collections of, 193.
Conservation of Artistic Energy, 61.
Continuity, Law of, 26.
—, supplied by traditional art, 202.
Continuous variations in evolution of styles, 152.
Cosmati Work, 188.
Cost, Principle of Least, 117.
Cottons, Indian hand-printed, 197.
Craft, differentiation of specialized branches of, 68.
Craft guild, analogy of, 92.
Cretan Ceramic Art, 147, 170.
— — —, influence on Melos, 170; on Egypt, 172; on Greek mainland, 171.

Cretan Ambassadors' presents to Egypt, 193.
Cross fertilization, analogy of, 149, 159, 188.
Culture, Art, basic conditions of living, 221.
—, —, character of influenced by social and economic environment, 221.
—, —, re-establishment of, 232.
Cultural Area, 29.
— —, meaning of term, 137.
Cultural influences, 88.
— conditions, 137, 138.
— affinity, 140.
— frontiers, 142; local differences, 143.
— field: *see* Cultural Area.
Cumulative effect of divergences from normal, 205.
Curve representing Art Styles, 163.
Cyclades, effect of Crete on pottery of, 170.
Cycles of Trade Activity, analogy of, 202, 208.
— of Artistic Energy, 210.

D.

De Vries, 154.
Decorative factor in Beauty, 33.
Demand factor in Styles, 152.
Depreciation of Art Values in Intercultural movement, 140.
Design, as a separate business, 81, 107.
Design and Execution, interdependence of, 50, 57.
— —, historical causes of separation between, 59.
— —, proportion of staff between, 78.
Design Studio, 82, 98.
— —, internal organization of, 91.
— —, analogy to Craft Guilds, 92.
— —, possible development, 99.
Designer, meaning of, 49.
—, free lance, 81, 82.
—, workshop, 98, 109.
—, studio, 100.
Desirability of Art examined, 217.
Desire for Art, how far universal, 215.
— —, may be economically ineffective, 217.
Desire for Wealth, assumed by Economic Theory, 215.
Differentiation and Reintegration, 64.
Diffusion of Wares, 188, 191.
Diminishing Returns, law of, in relation to art energy, 207.
Discontinuous variations, 154, 158.
Discoveries, effect on styles, 158.
Distance between cultural fields defined, 140.
Division of Labour, Adam Smith on, 41.

Division of Labour, limits of, in relation to works of Art, 44.
Drama, unity of, 47.

E.

Eclecticism, 158, 176.
Economic, wide interpretation of term, 6, 7.
Economic fitness, 110, 125.
— initiative, 134.
Economics, London School of, 5.
Education of each factor in production and distribution, 127.
—, problems of, 230.
Egyptian Art of Old Empire, 147.
— intercourse with Crete, 172.
— rigidity of Art culture, 181, 183, 184.
Elasticity of Art-values, 34, 140.
Energy, Art, 37.
—, —, periodic movements of, 201 et seq.
Enjoyment of work a factor in Great Art, 206.
Environment, influence of, on evolution of styles, 151.
Equilibrium between economic and art conditions, 123.
Evolution of Styles, 151.
Exchange Value, 28.
Execution not independent of Design, 50, 51, 57,
—, distinction between design and, 50.
Exhaustion of Artistic Impulse, 207.
— not simultaneous in different crafts, 207.
Experimental stage of production, 77.
Export to undeveloped countries, 196.
—, adaptations of style in country of, 195.
Expressive factor in Beauty, 33.

F.

Fashion Movements, 96, 97, 153.
— —, relation to Style Movements, 161.
— —, control of, 162.
Fatehpur Sikri, 177.
Federal Sovereignty, analogy of, 32, 48.
Fergusson, 30, 175, 176, 177.
Fertile Blends, 149, 174, 182.
Fertilization, cross, analogy of, 149, 159, 188.
Fine Art, 20, 35, 37, 201, 213.
— —, no short cut to, 214.
Fine Arts Commission, Great Britain, 232.
— — —, Washington, 232.
Fitness as a condition of Art-value, 35, 110.
—, economic, 111, 125.
—, technical, 110.
France, centre of studio design, 89.

France, how affected by Industrial Revolution, 227.

G.

Gallic influences in English Industrial Art, 91.
Gandhara Sculpture, 180.
Gardner, Ernest, 60.
Geographical separation between design and manufacture, 88.
Geometric Pottery, 147, 191.
German Werk-Bund, 232.
Glyptics, 119.
Goldsmith's work, separation of painting from, 68.
Gothic, evolution of, 174.
—, relation to Teutonic civilization, 181.
—, exhaustion of impulse in sixteenth century, 209.
Graduation of elements of Art-value, 29.
Great Art, 20, 35, 201, 213.
Greek Pottery, 22.
— —, effect of Crete on, 171.
— picture painting, 68.
— — —, separation from Ceramic Art, 68.
— vase painting, 147, 191.
Guild, Art Workers', 232.
— of Design, 92, 100.

H.

Hall, Aegean Archaeology, 147.
Health, social, meaning of, 222.
Health, social, essential to living art culture, 222.
Hellenistic Art in India, 179.
Hindu Art, contact with Mohammedan Art, 175.
— Painting, blend with Persian, 179.

I.

Immobility across international frontiers, 137.
Import, adaptation of style in country of, 194.
Independence, struggle for, by special branches of art, 64.
—, effect of, on art development and decay, 65, 66.
— of designer, 92.
Index-number of Art-value, Fergusson's, 30.
Indian Art, 175, 179.
Indo-Hellenistic Art, 179.
Industrial Revolution, 59, 63, 195, 225 et seq.
Initiative, artistic, and economic, 125 et seq , 134.
—, in raising standard of industrial art, 126 et seq.
—, its limitations under modern conditions, 128.
Innovation, struggle with tradition, 223.
Instability of Art-value when intercultural frontiers are crossed, 139.
Intercultural frontiers, 139.
Intermingling of Styles, 159.

International frontiers, tendency to become intercultural, 137, 143.
— dependence in Industrial Art, 89.
— intercourse in works of art, 135 passim.
— values, classical theory of, 135.
Interpenetration of wares, 187.
Isolation, effect of, on Art-values, 145.
—, impossibility of, in modern times, 148.
Italian Artists in India, 177, 188.

J.

Jackson, Sir Thomas, 21.
Japanese Art, relation to China and Korea, 189.
— travelling artists, 189.
— lacquer work, 60.
Jehangir, 177.
Jevons, Stanley, 18, 19.
Judgement, Art-value dependent on, 26, 27, 28.
Justi, Carl, 183.

K.

Keftin, Princes of, 193.
Knossos, destruction of, 209.
Korea, influence on Japan, 179.
Korin, 60.
Kutb Mosque, 175.

L.

Labour, work of art as product of, 17.
Lacquer work, Japanese, 60.
Law of Congruity, 21, 116.
Least Cost, Principle of, 117.
Lethaby, Professor, 20, 114, 174, 175, 181, 182, 193, 206.
Life History of Art Culture, 146.
Life of Social Organism, text of, 222.
Living Art Culture, conditions of, 222.
Local element in Art-value, 139.
— building traditions carried overseas, 142.
— cultures, tendency to merge in national culture, 143.
— materials, use of, 138.
London School of Economics, 5.
— University, 5.
Love, relation to Beauty, 23.

M.

Mackail, Life of Morris, 122.
Market Price, relation to Art-value, 120.
Marlowe, Christopher, 17.
Marshall, Dr., 26, 136, 137.
Maspero on Egyptian Art, 185.
Mass production characteristic of Industrial Revolution, 225.
— —, art forms proper to, 195.
Measurement of Art-value, 27.

Medals, designs for, 87.
Mediterranean Ceramic Art, 147.
Melos, Ceramic Art of, 171.
Metals, effect of discovery of, 147.
Michael Angelo, 38, 69.
Mill, John Stuart, 41.
Minoan Age, 170, 172, 209.
Mint Report, 87.
Minyan Ware, 171.
Misfit between Art and Industry, 125.
Mitchell, Wesley, 208.
Modern Industry defined, 72.
Modifications of Styles, 151 passim.
Mogul Art under Akbar, 176, 177.
— style of painting, 178.
Mohammedan Art, 175.
Mongol Conquests, influence of, on Arab Culture, 209.
Mongrel Blends, 198.
Monotheism in relation to cultural affinity, 180, 181.
Moriscos, 183.
Morris, William, 20, 122.
Museum Specimens, 139.
— —, as a means of diffusing art cultures, 193.
Mutations, 154.
Mycenaean Age, 147.

N.

National, used in cultural rather than political sense, 144.
Natural History of Great Art epochs, 211.
New York Report, 90.
Nobility of function in works of art, 19.

O.

Opinion, Art-value determined by, 27, 28.
Organic structure of works of art, 44.

P.

Painting, Hindu and Persian, 179.
— art carried to Central Asia, 179.
Parthenon, 30, 60.
Pathan Style, 76.
Period Work, 168.
Periodic Movements of Art energy, 201 passim.
Periodicity, no recognizable law of, in art movements, 202.
Persian art of painting, 179.
Perugino, 61, 62.
Peter Civis Romanus, 188.
Petrie, Sir W. Flinders, 204.
Pheidias, 38, 60.
Photography as means of diffusing knowledge of art cultures, 187.
Picture painting in Greece, 68.
Pietro Duro, 189.
Pin-making, division of labour in, 42.
Political frontiers, effect on Art-values, 138, 142, 143.

Portable and fixed works of art, 187.
Power, admiration for, as an element in appreciation, 118.
Process, arts grouped on basis of, 61, 65.
Producer, relation to central designer, 51.
Psychological factors in waves of art energy, 208.
Purchasing power, influence of, on styles, 155.

Q.

Quality, economics of, 19.
Quintilian, 21.

R.

Race-blending in relation to Art impulses, 169.
Random variations, 157.
Reaction between design and execution, 53.
— to influence standard of artistic production, 125.
— to stimulus—a test of healthy life, 222; impeded in transitional periods, 225.
Reintegration of Arts on lines of process, 64, 65.
Relativity of elements of work of art, 27.
Renaissance, 182, 209.
Research into history and conditions of great art epochs, 212.
Revolution, Industrial, 59, 63, 195, 225 et seq.
Revolutions of Civilization (Flinders Petrie), 204.
Richards, Professor Charles, 90.
Rigidity in Art Cultures, 183.
— in Egyptian Art, 184.
Royal Mint, 87.
Ruskin, 20, 114.

S.

Santa Maria Novella, church of, 47.
Saracenic Art, blend with European, 173.
— —, element in growth of Gothic, 174.
— —, contact with Hindu Art, 175.
Selection, Natural, in evolution of Styles, 152.
Self-consciousness of Art in Organized Industry, 152, 153.
Separation between Design and Industry, 78, 101.
Shah Jehan, 177.
Sicilian Architecture, 174, 183.
Sidgwick, Henry—Theory of International Trade, 135.
Simplicity—Art-value enhanced by, 117.
Sistine Chapel, 47.
Smith, Adam, 41 et seq.
Smith, Vincent, 178, 180.
Sovereignty, analogy of, 32.

Spain, union of Gothic and Saracenic Art in, 183.
Specialization in the Arts, 61.
Spencer, Herbert, 64.
Spontaneous Variations, 156.
Standardization of Product, 75.
Sterility of Union of Mohammedan and Hindu Architecture, 174.
Stimulus, reaction to, 222.
Strength, relative, of art cultures, 169.
Studio-design, development of, 82, 87, 92.
Style, evolution and modification of, 151.
—, definition of, 151.
— curve, 163, 164.
Styler, the, 83.
Subdivision, conditions of, in Works of Art, 45, 48.
— of design, 84.
Supply factors in evolution of styles, 157.
Synchronism, tendency towards, in great Art movements, 213.
Synthesis of art and economic conditions, 228.

T.

Taj Mahal, 30.
Technical Fitness as condition of Art-value, 110.
Teutonic Civilization, relation to Gothic Art, 181.
Time element, importance of, 146.
Time period of art cycles indefinite, 210.
Traditional art, 201, 224.
Transitional periods between art impulses, 224.
Travelling artists, 66, 188.
Trends, long-period, 163.
Tughlakabad, 176.
Turkestan, 179.

U.

Ultimate nature of Beauty not discussed, 15.
Unconscious processes in Art, 56, 71; diminution with growth of organization, 72.
Unity of works of art, 22, 32, 46, 47.
— compared to Sovereignty in State, 32.
—, effect on, by division of labour, 45, 46.
Utility in works of Art, 18.
—, meaning of, 19.
—, qualitative factor in, 19.
Utopian solutions, modern distrust of, 123.

V.

Value, Art, 26, 27, 28, 34, 138, 140.
—, exchange, 28.
—, international, 135.
Vase painting, Greek, 147, 148, 191.
Veroneo, 178.
Vital relations between art culture and environment, 225.

W.

Wakefield, Gibbon, 41.
Waste, elimination of, in relation to Art-value, 115.
Waves of Art Energy, 202 et seq.
— — —, breaking or subsidence of, 209.
— — —, psychological element in, 204.
Wealth, concentration or diffusion of, as affecting character of art culture, 223.
Wealth, universality of desire for, 215.
Werk-Bund, 232.
William of Sens, 188.
Work of Art, 17, 25, 26, 44.

X.

Xenophantos, 194.

3 9001 01593 4790

BARCODE
INSIDE